

DEIS Public Comments

1

Comment

April 14, 2004

I am writing in regards to the SR 99-Alaskan Way Viaduct and Seawall Replacement Project. I am in favor of the tunnel option. Even though it is more expensive than other options, the tunnel plan takes full advantage of the need to deeply excavate for the new seawall; the tunnel will leave our waterfront more attractive.

For a world-class city, as Seattle should become, we need to invest in our infrastructure now. Let's not try to do another cheap project, such as the Kingdome. Let's build something strong, solid, and long-lasting.

Sincerely,

Mark Hammarlund
2121 N. 143rd St.
Seattle, WA 98133
WSDOT Communications Office
360-705-7438
M/S 47326

2

Comment

My comment focused on a couple of areas. I wondered why the scope of many of the alternatives makes changes to the Battery Street Subway and to Aurora Avenue. While these improvements would be nice they do not relate to the more immediate need of replacing the Viaduct and Sea Wall before they become too deficient to allow their continued use..

The other area I wondered about was the tunnel alternative. The graphic shows a narrow chamber within the easterly portion of the southbound tunnel but does not identify it. I assume it is for ventilation, utilities, and/or emergency egress. I notice that there is a good sized area between the northbound tunnel and the existing Alaskan Way right-of-way line. I wondered if it would be feasible to construct the southbound tunnel but with a temporary chamber that could be removed and replaced in the northbound tunnel once it were built. That would leave room in the southbound tunnel for four lanes rather than three. The right-of-way is 180' wide and four (12') traffic lanes and four (10') shoulders only add up to 136' leaving 44' for barriers, tunnel walls, and utilities.

My reasoning behind a four lane tunnel is that this tunnel will last for 75 years or more and six-lanes is already functionally obsolete. If the tunnel can be built with 8 lanes, it should be built, even if two lanes are not immediately opened to traffic. This is a major truck route connecting the Ballard/Interbay area with points south. I doubt single-lane on and off connections to Elliott Avenue will meet 2030 demand. Elliott Avenue is also part of the Northwest Expressway shown in the 1967 regional transportation study. While Elliott may never be fully limited access, the portion between Denny Way and Market Street (Ballard) could foreseeably be upgraded to a 45+ mph divided roadway (see SR 99 between Denny Way and Green Lake) . Also, if the tunnel is considered as part of the larger corridor including the SR 509 freeway and its future connection to I-5, HOV lanes will need to be constructed. The HOV lanes are already programmed from the SR 509/I-5 connection to the First Avenue South Bridge. Also, the Battery Street Subway may someday be replaced with a six-lane tunnel. All these things would seem to point to an eight-lane tunnel rather than six.

3

Comment

I would simply like to state my preference for the Tunnel Alternative. The various long term benefits of this solution have been amply restated. The costs are of course challenging, but there is a palette of available funding options. Seattle needs decisive, visionary transportation planning, and only striving for ambitious public projects will promise a Seattle that is a leader, not a follower.

4

Comment

It is my opinion that the draft EIS is deficient in evaluating impacts of construction on pedestrian traffic and safety on the waterfront. Further, the draft EIS is deficient in evaluating impacts of dirt and noise pollution on the waterfront area during the proposed construction. Additionally, the draft EIS is deficient in evaluating impacts of lost parking and waterfront access for residents and visitors to the waterfront, both during the proposed construction process as well as once the project is completed. And most importantly, the "Public Hearings" simply did not exist. the format was an open house with no opportunity for public comment. All comments were given in private formats -- such as online, written, or through transcription. It is my right to have my comments heard by other concerned citizens, and my right to be able to hear the comments of others. No opportunity was given for me to exercise these rights. The process is flawed and irrevocable damage has been done. The agency orchestrating this process has been arrogant and non-responsive and as a result, opens the process up to litigation. The time and cost to correct the deficiencies will just be a further reason to upset this process. What an outrage. Management should be reprimanded if not replaced. Sincerely, Suzan N Elrick

5

Comment

Do it right - go for the best solution to our transportation problem. Think about what our legacy to our children and grandchildren will be if they have to amend an inferior project.

6

Comment

My name is Suzan Nettleship, and I've been a resident on the waterfront for approximately -- well almost four years.

Let me begin by saying that this public hearing and open house is actually quite inadequate for ascertaining what are the public views and the sharing of view points from different constituencies. I would encourage and say that Washington DOT should indeed have true public hearings, where the opinions of the various constituencies are heard and commented upon. Because, without that very vital element, there is no real coalition building and understanding of the project.

The information presented is interesting, but let's also address the deficiencies of what is presented here today, as well as the issues that are included in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement.

First of all, the plans that are submitted within the Draft EIS, I have been advised, do not truly reflect what is in the current planning stage and, therefore, are presenting false information.

As to the areas that have been covered in the Draft EIS, there are several areas of deficiency. In particular, I believe there has been insufficient review and planning devoted to the economic impacts on the existing businesses, residences, and use of the waterfront during the construction period. This is a particular concern in that it is not a temporary circumstance when a construction period can last as long as eleven years. For a number of constituencies that could be effectively a lifetime in the cycle of a business or someone's residency on the waterfront.

Additionally, I don't believe that the EIS has adequately addressed alternatives to both options dealing with transportation during the construction period, which might ultimately impact the total construction, and have a positive affect on reducing the amount of time required for construction.

There has been insufficient time devoted to looking at the alternatives in terms of traffic flow, traffic flow means and methods, which includes both commuter traffic, destination traffic, truck delivery, as well as through trucking and commerce related transportation. Insufficient analysis has been done as to how to mitigate or compensate for the economic impacts to the various parties affected by construction, in terms of reduce revenue to retailers, reduced revenue to the cruise ships, the economic impact on land values, and what can be done for mitigation during the construction period to the various constituencies.

Additionally, there has not been enough study or analysis given to the displacement of existing parking, both for residents, office itinerant, and mass transportation, wheeled vehicles, such as busses and taxis. It seems as though little planning or analysis has been put into planning and how there can be a coordination of the need for this traffic with existing mass transit or the funding of alternative of mass transit.

Ultimately, whatever alternative design is put into effect, the current land owners, inhabitants and users of the waterfront should not suffer the economic brunt during the construction period.

7

Comment

I do not believe that the EIS does not adequately address negative affects on the residents of the waterfront during the construction, or consider options to reduce these negative affects. Specifically, the EIS does not adequately address the option of the shortest construction periods. All the alternatives seem to be based on maintaining the current traffic flow during the construction and, thus, leading to longer construction periods and costs, reduced construction costs created by shorter construction periods and minimizing traffic detours during construction, and economic impacts during construction on the waterfront related to reduced property values, lost business, lost tax revenues and reduced revenues from cruise ship patrons. The EIS does not adequately address pedestrian traffic during and after the construction, specifically for pedestrians getting to and from the Pike Place Market and the waterfront. All the alternatives don't consider extending the tunnel for the trains further north, which would improve the traffic flow on the northern part of Alaskan Way.

8

Comment

Public hearings did not exist. Format was an open house with no opportunity for public comment. All comments were given in private formats -- such as online, written, or through transcription. I believe true open forums should have key representatives involved in the planning of the project in attendance and monitoring the discussion(s). Draft EIS is deficient in evaluating impacts of lost parking and waterfront access for residents and visitors to the waterfront, both during the proposed construction process as well as once the project is completed. Draft EIS is deficient in identifying costs and construction period impacts of the proposed "flyover". In addition, draft EIS does not address the impact on the north waterfront area (Pike to Broad) in terms of noise, visual pollution, traffic impact during construction of the flyover and subsequent periods of viaduct construction as well as during the period of removal of this unsightly edifice. Draft EIS is deficient in evaluating impacts of construction on pedestrian traffic and safety on the waterfront. Draft EIS is deficient in evaluating impacts of dirt and noise pollution on the waterfront area during the proposed construction. Currently I am leaning toward no replacement and the demolition of the existing viaduct.

9

Comment

The draft EIS does not explore the option of not rerouting traffic during construction. The option of focusing purely on the final solution and letting traffic reroute itself naturally during implementation could save time and money. This is a critical option that should be further explored.

Note: Apologies if this is a duplicate submission. The first time I entered the comment I do not believe that I entered all of my personal info.

10

Comment

The EIS does not address the concept of building a final solution without temporarily rerouting traffic. It needs to investigate the concept of focusing purely on the final solution and letting traffic reroute itself naturally in the interim in order to save time and money.

11

Comment

The Seattle waterfront has come a long way in the past decade. The development of a new hotel, residential condominiums, the cruise ship terminal and other businesses has begun to evolve the space into an inviting and desirable place for Seattle residents and tourists to visit.

Some of the options for temporary traffic rerouting during construction will destroy this progress. The Battery Street Flyover option will block access to the restaurants, businesses, and homes on the waterfront. The temporary aerial viaduct will do the same in the more southern areas. Both of these options will drop property values and discourage Seattle residents and tourists from visiting the waterfront.

If we choose to use these tools during construction it is obvious that a hypothetical traffic flow issues during construction is more important to the city than the residents, businesses, and economy of the Seattle waterfront. I do not believe that the EIS does an adequate job of assessing the impact of these temporary structures on the businesses, property values, and overall perception of the waterfront during construction. Along with all of these things, the EIS needs to discuss how parking will be replaced, how the concerts on the pier will continue, and how day-to-day activity on the waterfront will carry on.

There should be a full assessment of options that involve building the final solutions without putting in place these monstrous structures. Options where traffic reroutes itself naturally during construction need to be fully evaluated. Speaking as a homeowner on the waterfront, the Battery Street Flyover detour option and the temporary aerial structure are unacceptable.

12

Comment

I attended the public hearing earlier tonight (4/27). After reviewing the plans for the temporary flyover bridge I wanted to make sure that I provided my complete thoughts on this option. I am a homeowner on the waterfront. I care a great deal about the quality of life on the waterfront. I believe that the temporary flyover bridge being built makes the aerial plan a non-option. As a resident, I find this option completely unacceptable. The draft EIS makes no mention of how building this structure will impact local business (Marriott & Edgewater hotels, restaurants, shops, etc..). It also makes no mention of how building this structure will impact the property values of residents on the waterfront. These are major concerns and I would like to see them fully addressed before any plans involving the temporary flyover structure are seriously considered.

13

Comment

I think that the three comments that I want to make about the Draft EIS are: No. 1, is that I'm concerned that it doesn't mention anything about business impacts or how we're going to maintain the businesses that are alive and well in the water front right now throughout construction, and what we're going to do there. No. 2, it says nothing about property values for people that live on the waterfront, which I do, and I care a whole lot about that. And No. 3, there's no specific mention of the option where we build something to replace the viaduct but in the meantime don't do a lot of work to reroute traffic, we kind of accept the fact that traffic might need to reroute itself, and we get the job done as fast as we can by just focusing on the final product. That is all. Thank you.

14

Comment

I WORRY THAT THE PEOPLE MAKING THE DECISIONS ABOUT THE VIADUCT ARE ONLY VIEWING THE VIADUCT FROM THE OUTSIDE, SEEING THE LESS THAN ATTRACTIVENESS OF THE STRUCTURE AND WANTING TO ERRADICATE IT POSSIBLY EVEN PUTTING IT UNDERGROUND. I FEEL THIS WOULD BE A TERRIBLE MISTAKE AS I HAVE CHERISHED THE VIEWS FROM THE VIADUCT FOR YEARS ON A DAILY BASIS AND FEEL IT IS THE BEST VIEW THE CITY OFFERS. THERE IS NO WHERE SO PUBLICALLY ACCESSABLE THAT ALLOWS YOU TO SEE NOT ONLY BEAUTIFUL VIEWS OF THE SOUND BUT ALSO GREAT VIEWS OF THE CITY IT SELF. WHILE I REALIZE THE NEED TO REBUILD OR COME UP WITH A NEW PLAN I HOPE YOU WILL SEE THE TERRIBLE TRAGEDY THAT IT WOULD BE TO LOWER THIS ACCESS TO GO UNDERGROUND OR EVEN LEVEL WITH ALASKAN WAY. THE ONLY WAY TO MAINTAIN THE FANTASTIC VIEWS IS TO KEEP THE VIADUCT OR IT'S REPLACEMENT WELL ABOVE GROUND. THANKS FOR LISTENING.

15

Comment

I would very much like to see the tunnel alternative, in spite of the higher cost. I believe this to be the solution that provides the greatest value in human terms, creating a traffic solution together with an aesthetic, useable surface space which can be used for the enjoyment of the public, visitors and residents. It represents a large scale, long term, 100 year vision instead of a quick fix decision based solely on the cheapest solution. If we are going to do this project, let us do it in a way which will add economic benefits from commerce and tourism and a rich vitality to our Seattle Waterfront for everyone to enjoy.

16

Comment

Please make sure that whichever plan is accepted that there is a premium on the environmental impact for fish and habitat. I am very concerned about the impacts of this seawall on fish and other marine life.

Comment

First, my compliments on a beautifully-laid out, easy-to-read Draft EIS.

I urge you to select the tunnel option as the preferred alternative for the Alaskan Way Viaduct and Seawall replacement project. This project presents us with a fantastic opportunity to reshape the face of the Seattle waterfront for the benefit of the whole region. Let's think long term and pony up the cash to rebuild this thing the right way!

However, there is one major problem with the tunnel option as it is currently configured. We should not build a structure that increases the general traffic capacity of the corridor. This is at odds with the goals of the Seattle Comprehensive Plan and wrongly places emphasis on moving more cars instead of more people and goods. Instead, we should focus on transportation demand management techniques and increased transit service to cope with future demand.

Sincerely,

Jessyn Schor

Comment

Alaskan Way Viaduct Comments:

(1) Rebuild/Aerial options: Has there been any thought of moving the NB Seneca St. offramp to another location instead (maybe Spring St, University St would be more desirable, but it has been redeveloped and no longer available). This is because of Seneca St being really a westbound one way street (it is two way between 1st and 2nd Avenues). This ramp frequently backs up, since the 1st and Seneca intersection has lots of pedestrian traffic, and Seneca St not being a through street, most cars turn left or right at 1st Avenue. If Spring St was used instead, being an Eastbound one way street, this would disburse the traffic better, than the current situation.

(2) 1st Avenue:

(2A) Between Seneca and Columbia Sts. Currently the traffic pattern is 3 lanes NB and 2 lanes SB (both of these figures include the parking lane, with no parking in the peak). North of Seneca (or Spring, if above comment is considered), this lane arrangement makes sense. South of Seneca (or Spring), this arrangement does not make sense, since most of the traffic is headed to the Columbia St. on-ramp. Has the City of Seattle thought about changing the traffic pattern, so it would be 3 lanes SB, and 2 lanes NB on 1st Avenue between Seneca (Spring) and Columbia Sts.?

(2B) Between King St. and Yesler Way. Currently, the City of Seattle allows parking during the PM rush hour on 1st Avenues between King St and Yesler Way. This has been a sore spot with Metro Transit, especially on weekday nights with a Mariner's game, with only one lane of traffic open. Has been any thought of a bus (only during PM peak) lane on Alaskan Way to mitigate this disaster?

(3) Slope of AWV between Pike St and Battery St. Tunnel (tunnel and bypass tunnel options)

How steep is this slope, and how will icy weather affect this portion of the new roadway? Due to this slope, is this why WSDOT has proposed an exit at the bottom of the slope (6 lane tunnel option), just in case the slope gets too icy, so vehicles have a way to escape the tunnel?

(4) Battery St. Tunnel upgrades are a high option, even it should be done in the rebuild option too. North of Battery St. Tunnel options are the lowest priority for fixing up, and if necessary, put off until a phase 2 option.

(5) I prefer the lowered SR-99 option for north of the tunnel, since it would reconnect the neighborhoods better. Widening Mercer will simply cause the 5th Ave N and Mercer St Intersection to reach LOS F. A better solution, as shown in some of your drawings, is a new Roy St. Underpass, with the connection at 9th and Mercer. This would be a much smoother transition.

(5) In the rebuild option, strong consideration should be given to rebuilding the approach to the Battery St. Tunnel, Columbia St on ramp, and Seneca (Spring) St off ramp? and not simply retrofit.

(6) In the Rebuild/Aerial options, how much will the temporary roadway cost and how much more material (concrete/rebar?) has to be disposed of?

(7) I have doubts with your rebuild option traffic figures, since it has substandard shoulders and if there was an accident or stalled vehicle, how

much delay of traffic will occur? Also, in the rebuild option, I cannot see how you can have wider lanes with the similar footprint you purpose (the aerial option is a 20 foot wider ROW, I believe)?

(8) How will the temporary aerial structure affect waterfront businesses, since the elevated structure will be essentially next to them?

(9) Finally, I seem to favor the 6 lane tunnel option, because the existing viaduct can be used for the longest time before the transition period, and provides for existing capacity. The bypass tunnel option would require a 6 lane surface street, in a pedestrian type environment. The aerial and rebuild options require a lot of throwaway costs (building another elevated structure to keep traffic moving).

Thanks for allowing comment on the Alaskan Way Viaduct DEIS

Sincerely
Warren Yee
5912 23rd Avenue South
Seattle, WA 98108-2944
wye@earthlink.net

19

Comment

I work Downtown and have always thought that the current Viaduct is not only an eyesore, but unsafe as well. It's got narrow lanes, short sight lines and lousy offramps. The Tunnel option, while the most invasive choice, will open up the waterfront views for the buildings (condos and businesses alike) closest to the area as well as the views of downtown from the Waterfront. It also appears to add additional greenery and possibly pedestrian areas to the waterfront. I think that this will improve the overall impression of two of our most popular tourist areas - the waterfront and Pike Place Market. I note that there is some concern over the loss of views from the Viaduct if the elevated roadway is removed. In my opinion, this is a safety issue rather than one of views - people should be paying attention to their driving rather than gaping at the view of the sound.

20

Comment

24 April 2004 To: www.wsdot.wa.gov/projects.Viaduct From: The Peters Family VFW2713@aol.com Subject: Our Built and Paid For Viaduct along the waterfront Attn: Appropriations and hopefully, a Common Sense Committee (if we have one) Gentlemen; There is an old Adage coined by some very wise men that discovered after centuries of heavy study; that: 'If it Ain't Broke, Don't Fix it !!!' Our Viaduct Ain't Broke !!! Your \$3 to \$4 Billion Cost Range "Estimates" for Repairing and/or Replacing our Viaduct are totally unacceptable. It shouldn't take anything like \$3 Billion to repair what we already have, that provides commuters with quick and easy, access to North / South unsnarled traffic. Not to mention the beautiful sound, mountain and city views we are greeted with.... Visitors gasp in delight, and Love it.... The people that designed our old friend deserve an award of excellence in public project design, and an apology from those warped visionaries that would even think of tearing it down. Our Viaduct Ain't Broke !!! Yes, he's been wounded in the battles with Mother Nature and Nut-Case Drivers. But like the strong old soldier he is, if we bring in a field hospital, he'll live to serve us several more decades... Our Viaduct isn't dead, he's only been clipped a little in the legs... Don't write him off for some stupid leaky hole in the ground replacement fresh from UC Berkeley's Skrool of Urban Lunacy. The view in tunnels, Stinks !!! Respectfully, Pete and Dianne Peters (AKA: Taxed to the Max in Munchkin Land) 7022 Earl Ave. N.W. Seattle, WA 98117 206-784-8559 VFW2713@aol.com

21

Comment

Employment, RFPs, monies allocated for contracting of minority and disadvantaged combine to bidding requirements.

22

Comment

The Legal Unions of Seattle, WA should be involved in the destruction and construction of this project. Make sure, please, that no people are put in jeopardy of injury when it starts.

It would be better to get rid of the above surface route altogether; without a tunnel, it would be much safer for pedestrians.

23

Comment

Dear WashDOT & City of Seattle,

I write about the proposed rebuilding of the Alaskan Way Viaduct because I think the design of the rebuild is crucial to keeping Seattle a livable city.

My big concerns are the following:

- . Maintaining enough right of way for walkers
- . Connecting the Waterfront to the city - especially Pike Place market.

To meet these aims, I favor the cut-and-cover tunnel design alternative. And to make this - or any design - effective, I believe that we need to follow these guidelines:

- . There should be no net increase in roadway to Alaskan Way.
- . Any additional traffic on the surface should be dispersed among all avenues running through the downtown corridor.
- . The lid over SR 99 should extend from Pike to Battery.
- . The trolley on Alaskan Way should be moved to Western to create room for destinations on the waterfront and better neighborhood connections by trolley

Thank you for your consideration.

Regards,

Todd Vogel

Todd Vogel, Ph.D.
Director,
Trinity Institute for Urban Learning and Action
206-347-3390
Todd.Vogel@trincoll.edu

24

Comment

As the owner of 5 properties along the Alaskan Way corridor, including the Western & Denny Worklofts, Pier 70, Skyway luggage, a parking lot at Western & Seneca and the newly completed OK Hotel (a low income housing project), Triad is seriously concerned about the project impacts to our various properties and their respective tenants. Triad is generally in favor of the full tunnel option, with the caveat that the construction schedule is kept to an absolute minimum. We would be in favor of major traffic reorientation; i.e. most of 99 traffic shifting to I-5, to be able to complete the construction in the least amount of time. We are opposed to any form of the Broad Street Detour option, especially any option which includes a Broad Street overpass. This overpass would have serious impacts on traffic, shading and traffic. This overpass would be located within 20 feet from the front door of our street side restaurant Rippe's and would reduce the visibility of the entry to our parking to almost zero. Nor are we in favor of the proposed SAM tunnel. This concept would seriously impact the traffic flow into and out of Pier 70 and would impact access by tenants and customers alike. I should note at this point, that the Broad Street overpass was not discussed in the numerous meetings over the last year and became an 'option' only at the 11th hour prior to the DEIS. The SAM tunnel also was also included in the DEIS but I was told repeatedly that this design was not a going to be considered. My main worry is that these last two items are mysterious and may or may not be considered in the final plan for the Viaduct/Seawall project. In addition, I have never participated in a public comment program that has appeared to be no more than a public forum for discussion with cookies. Is this process official?

25

Comment

Okay. I'm Daniel Ramras. I represent Triad Pier 70, LLC and numerous other Triad properties on the Alaskan Way thoroughfare. We own and occupy the Pier 70 property, which is at the foot of Broad Street, we own property three blocks north of Broad Street. We own a parking lot a block east of the viaduct, on Seneca, and the Okay Hotel, which is directly adjacent to the Alaskan Way Viaduct. Therefore, we have substantial holdings and are going to be impacted dramatically by the Alaskan Way Viaduct Seawall Project.

We are in favor of a tunnel option, a full tunnel option. We are extremely concerned about traffic and, therefore, would like to see the State and City work on a plan that is the shortest construction plan possible, which would entail closing down all unnecessary traffic roots during the construction period. We are opposed to a Broad Street overpass, and we are also opposed to a Seattle Art Museum tunnel. Both of those options would create an immense traffic problem, and visual problems for the owners and tenants of Pier 70. The Broad Street overpass would create a substantial visual impact which would almost definitely create vacancies on Pier 70, and at a time when occupancy is of key importance, obvious traffic impacts and shading impacts.

The Seattle Art Museum underpass would also create traffic problems directly at the front of Pier 70, on Alaskan Way. One of the largest problems that I have with the presentation of alternatives over the last year is the discrepancy between the items that have appeared in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement and item that were not discussed prior to issuance of a Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Specifically, the Broad Street overpass was not a topic of discussion and was brought up after the comments, the closure of comments, in the Fall of 2003. And the concept of the Seattle Art Museum underpass, the tunnel, was verbally, at least, taken off the table, and yet still appears on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement.

We are, again, extremely opposed to the concept of the Broad Street detour option, bringing all truck traffic from I-99 Southbound down Broad Street, onto Alaskan Way.

26

Comment

Explore Alternative to constructing the temporary Battery Street Flyover and the 5-year elevated Bypass on Alaskan Way. Disperse traffic during interim construction period along I-5 and city streets including Alaskan Way. Save money, attempt to shorten construction time on Battery Street - Tunnel component.

27

Comment

My name is Arthur M. Skolnik. I'm a fellow of the American Institute of Action. I'm a land use consultant. I live at 2515 Fourth Avenue, Apartment 2702, Seattle, Washington 98121.

I'm here to provide comments regarding the adequacy of the Draft Environmental Impact for the Alaskan Way Viaduct and Seawall Project.

First I want to express my deep concern and opposition to the way this public hearing open house is being conducted in contrast to historical examples of public hearings and the ability for citizens to comment and have other citizens be able to hear and acknowledge or refute in their comments other comments from their fellow community members. I strongly request that the comment period be extended and that the State DOT set three additional public hearing dates that are not open houses whereby the public can comment in the traditional form, with an open mic, with a sign-up sheet, with limited times, and the general public and media is allowed to hear those comments. I feel this is a breach of the State and National Environmental Policy Act, the way this is being carried out.

Now to my comments about the Draft EIS. I feel there is a bias in the Draft EIS that has created alternatives that reflect the most expensive options. They are trying to come up with designs that deal with both the replacement of the infrastructure, as well as dealing with the construction phase. Most examples in the Draft EIS deal with keeping traffic flowing during construction. That aspect of the designs extends the length of the construction project by two times, which leaves this mega-project open to cost overruns and construction interruptions that go on for 9 to 11 years. The options that are being proposed need to be addressed in terms of their possible shortest construction period, and that does include not keeping traffic flowing in that corridor during the construction period. We need to have a more adequate discussion of creating the best preferred alternative in the shortest period of time, and still allow the flow of vehicular traffic within the City of Seattle during construction, not necessarily in the construction corridor.

Specifically, I feel that the Draft EIS does not adequately allow for an intelligent discussion of the impacts that will be felt by the businesses and residences and the tourist industry along the Alaskan Way, during construction and even before construction. We need to understand what the economic impacts will be, what the business interruption costs will be, and how to develop mitigation compensation so that we don't "throw the baby out with the bath water."

The State DOT must adequately address all the aspects of this project to a level of specificity that allows the public to understand the project and then make decisions, whether it means, selling your home, closing your business, deciding not to take a cruise ship, or not attend the Seattle Aquarium, because of the disruption. That is not discussed in the Draft, and it is a serious omission.

I'll leave it at that. Thank you.

28

Comment

Despite my Portland address, I've regularly visited Seattle to analyze the Link LRT, Greenline monorail, Lake Union Streetcar and the Viaduct transportation projects; I am outspoken pro-rail in Portland and around the nation. The Seattle rail projects mentioned above are all the worst case examples of preposterously faulty engineering I have ever seen. The Link LRT Bypass of South Center is a previous, multifaceted error that cannot be corrected with a spur. The Lake Union Streetcar is better routed into the DSTT at Convention Place Station, NOT on Westlake to Westlake Mall. The best monorail route to Ballard is via one of the "East Alternative" options, NOT Interbay. The best monorail route through downtown is along I-99/Alaskan Way, Battery Street to Lake Union and the East Alternative. These Waterfront routes have many advantages: optimal destination station citing for ridership/revenue, view preservation, development opportunities, construction cost savings, etc. The 2nd Avenue route is too constrictive, too disruptive for monorail. 2nd and nearby 3rd are already well-served with transit, but the Waterfronts are neglected. Duuh. Pardon my French. I support undergrounding the viaduct. There should be NO EXIT-ENTRANCE in the Central District. An interchange near Royal Brougham is sufficient, and, the entrance/exit off Western and Elliott can remain if rebuilt so I-99 will run UNDER these streets. A Bell or Battery Street tunnel keep it simple. Washington State and Seattle Transportation planning agencies are SO SCREWED-UP, a public REVOLT is inexorable. Incompetence, ignorantly or willfully committed by various special interests, purposefully enact criminal malfeasance and MUST BE ROOTED OUT or Seattle economy and culture will continue to STAGNATE. A good start might be to relocate Hammering Man to Gasworks Park. The context of its current is an insult to 'us' flatblack, featureless, 2-dimensional citizens who actually live by strenuous, monotonous toil rather than office tower button-pushing, paper-shuffling cocktail luncheons and deal making. Hammering Man does not feel at home in the Seattle culture mayhem-grovel and wants to move where he'll feel more useful. I feel so sorry for Seattle. Get your act together! Start by unplugging Sound Transit and merciless scrutinize WSDOT and Seattle transportation agency troglodytes.

29

Comment

To the staff of WSDOT

All Seattle-through traffic should travel underground from Atlantic Street into the Battery Street Tunnel and that Alaskan Way should receive no net gain in roadway.

Further study should be given to analyzing and addressing the following considerations:

Pike Place to Waterfront Lid

The tunnel option includes a new viaduct from Pine to Battery. Extensive analysis should be made to develop a pedestrian descent over SR 99 from Virginia, south, to Alaskan Way.

Access Road

I challenge the need for the access road as presented in the cross-section diagram for the tunnel option. Analysis should be given to providing delivery access from the curb of Alaskan Way, in keeping with the style along the other downtown avenues.

No Net Increase in Roadway to Alaskan Way

Alaskan Way should not increase in width from curb to curb or number of lanes. In essence, it should mimic any other downtown avenue.

No net Increase in Speed on Alaskan Way

The speed limit on Alaskan Way should be no more than 30 mph. Traffic lights should be set to move traffic between 22 and 28 mph—again, in accordance with other downtown avenues.

Distribute Additional Traffic Among All Downtown Avenues

As changes are made to SR 99, any additional traffic directed to the surface should be spread equally among all of the downtown avenues. I-5 should also be considered as an alternative for increased capacity, especially if it is reconfigured.

Construction Timeline and Costs

Consideration and analysis should be given toward the option of closing SR 99 for the duration of construction and absorbing traffic flow through a re-knitted downtown street grid.

Thank you for your consideration,

Michael Mariano, AIA
Architect

The Miller|Hull Partnership, LLP

www.millerhull.com

71 Columbia - Floor 6

Seattle, WA 98104

206-254-2020 direct

30

Comment

I vote for the tunnel alternative, even though it is more costly and will take longer to build. In the long run, the tunnel will be better for Seattle because it will make the waterfront more useful and attractive. This will attract more visitors, business, and buildings to downtown.

31

Comment

- West Seattle needs capacity of existing viaduct to be maintained, regardless of alternative.
- Construction period/impact significant issue as well.
- Good opportunity for city to improve other waterfront deficiencies such as undersized ferry terminal.

32

Comment

It is my opinion that the only alternatives worth considering are the tunnel variations. The obvious point being that they open up the waterfront to development. Secondly, they will replace the most garish aspect of downtown life. I've lived in Seattle for three years and I think its a beautiful city on the whole. However, a disappointment for me was seeing this massive snake of concrete, (at eye level from most side streets), between myself and the water. I realize most of us can have very little understanding of the true expense that would be involved with the tunnel alternative, but I believe even those who do not support it will wish they had when they see yet another towering concrete mass or 8 lanes of surface streets.

33

Comment

May 26, 2004

Ms. Allison Ray
Alaska Way Viaduct and Seawall Replacement Project Office
999 Third Avenue, Suite 2424
Seattle, WA 98104

RE: Comment on Draft EIS

Dear Ms. Ray,

As one of Washington's Top 100 companies and one that has maintained its headquarters here in Seattle for over 30 years, Shurgard Storage Centers is inherently tied to the economic development and general welfare of this great city and the surrounding region. We also happen to be on the "front line" of the proposed construction zone as our Pier 57 facility is located at the bottom of University Street (1334 Alaska Way), and will have an unobstructed view of the progress and impact of this project.

Evaluating the various options for this project with a long-term view, we would offer our most energetic support to the Tunnel Alternative. Like most, we believe a strong connection between the Central Business District/Pike Place Market/Pioneer Square districts and the Waterfront is critical to the long-term economic health of the city, and the removal of all aerial structures is critical to making this connection viable.

Furthermore, the noise and air pollution generated by the high-traffic volumes on the existing viaduct (as well as any future aerial structures) are detrimental to the physical health of all residents and visitors to the city and negatively impact Seattle's visual appeal, and we would support all efforts to direct as much traffic as possible underground.

Lastly, comparing the Tunnel Alternative to the Bypass Tunnel, it seems intuitive that lower traffic volumes on the Alaskan Way surface street are better for all of the reasons stated above, and so we would again voice our support for the Tunnel Alternative as the best of all options.

Regarding the short-term impacts, we have a specific concern regarding our Pier 57 Facility. That particular facility handles a significant amount of traffic via large semi-trucks and moving vans on a weekly, if not daily basis. These large vehicles approach our facility from the south, along the right-of-way just east of the existing viaduct, and are able to adequately access our store while parked parallel to the west face of our building. We would like to be informed by the Final EIS as to the measures your agency will be taking to ensure this access route to our facility remain accessible by large transport vehicles during the construction period.

We thank you for the opportunity to comment on this tremendous undertaking, and are eager to see this project move forward. This endeavor will greatly benefit our city and region, and we are glad to be in a position to contribute, even in this small way.

We look forward to reviewing the Final EIS regarding the above items as well as the final selection of the various alternatives. Please feel free to contact myself if you have any questions or comments.

Sincerely,

Stephen Bourne
SR. Design Manager
Shurgard Storage Centers, Inc.

34

Comment

I'd rather be stuck in traffic on an elevated roadway than in a tunnel. No tunnels!

The surface option is the worst because of the increased traffic and because of the effect it would have on the public use of the waterfront. It would be as bad as running a train down the middle of Rainier Ave.

There needs to be at least one downtown exit, which I don't see with the tunnel options.

This project isn't for next week, next month, or next year, or even just for the next generation. Damn the cost. Do the right thing. Go Ariel.

"It's got to be the going, not the getting there that's good." - Harry Chapin

35

Comment

What's best for Seattle is tearing down the viaduct, decreasing traffic along the waterfront, and making the project affordable for all. Seattle's small geographical boundaries necessitates this. Let us NOT lose sight of these three needs as we look at the proposals.

After graciously considering each of the proposals on the table, I am concerned that none of the proposals adequately address all three of these goals. The tunnel is beautiful, but outrageously expensive and is only going to get more expensive once we start digging. The tunnel also does nothing to decrease traffic and air pollution along the waterfront. All of the other proposals (surface, arterial, and rebuild) keep the loud, unnecessary traffic with an equally loud, and unappealing structure. This is not acceptable.

The People's Waterfront Coalition is cheap, reasonable, beautiful, and environmentally-friendly. It took forever just for Seattle to build or even begin to build a GreenLine because of its high cost. It will take centuries before Seattle agrees to pay for and even find a way to pay for something like the tunnel option.

We need a solution fast. The viaduct must be replaced before the next earthquake. Seattle has done more to protect itself from a "perceived" terrorist attack than a real and scientifically proven, destructive and deadly earthquake. Building a tunnel in 9-15 years is not a good solution. In fact, every non-People's Waterfront Coalition proposal sits around waiting 7-15 years for a natural force to take the viaduct down. WE must take the viaduct down SAFELY and EFFICIENTLY with the least amount of harm done to people and the surrounding structures beside it.

I love Seattle because of its small, neighborhood layout and feel. Any of the proposals besides the People's Waterfront Coalition destroys any possibility of bringing what is Seattle to the waterfront. If anything is built besides the People's Waterfront Coalition, the waterfront will continue to be separated from the rest of what is Seattle. We need an accessible, quiet, happy waterfront. We, the people, do. Cars don't need this.

The cars will find elsewhere to go. The people will actually use other means of transportation. They will choose to use the GreenLine which they have already paid for and which is being constructed for them. They will go 20 minutes out of their way to use I-5. They will carpool. They will.

IF YOU BUILD IT, THEY WILL COME. If you build a six-lane surface highway, you will bring more traffic THROUGH the city. This traffic doesn't STOP in the city. People will bypass Seattle without ever giving it a glance or a dime as they travel through Seattle to Vancouver and Portland. This is not good tourism. This is not good for the economic growth of our region.

The People's Waterfront Coalition brings people TO Seattle. It brings them TO Seattle--not through it. And the strongest point for the People's Waterfront Coalition is that it brings people into the city to LOVE the city. To love the views, the water, the mountains, and the air. People will come to Seattle to escape, rather than heading an hour or two outside Seattle to feel as if they need to escape.

Let Seattle BREATHE. Let Seattle grow as it was meant to grow. The west coast is radically different from the east coast. That's why people vacation here. To increase the speed and the amount of traffic along the waterfront is to split the heart of Seattle in two. Don't divide Seattle. Unite Seattle and we will all be happier, healthier, and richer.

36

Comment

The obvious practical missing design alternative is a surface highway design with overhead or underground east-west crossings for pedestrians and (in limited cases) possible overhead or underground east-west service vehicles and boat access), combined with greatly or completely limiting surface access to the new surface highway from side streets. Offering this tune-up would make this alternative far more practical, eliminating many traffic lights otherwise needed to support pedestrian and vehicle surface crossings. These over-crossings or under-crossings and limiting surface access to the newly rebuilt wide surface highway would greatly reduce travel times, while not greatly increasing costs (with cost and major travel time delay savings by eliminating traffic lights. This "lowest cost" alternative would become far more practical. See what San Francisco has done in removing its waterfront viaduct. This new alternative might be called, "the most practical, most ! affordable, most workable Alternative. This is so practical. Why was this not explored before? Tom Bernard

37

Comment

I support the full tunnel alternative. Let's rebuild the waterfront into the great civic amenity that it should be!

38

Comment

Excellent that we're now moving forward on the project. Seattle has to embrace feasible, state-of-the art solutions to it's problems--and traffic in this city is quite a problem.

My two cents regarding the Alaska Way Viaduct/Seawall Alternatives basically boils down to: choose a tunnel alternative--not just a simple aerial/replacement.

There are many reasons that I have behind this choice:

1) increased roadway capacity--if Seattle continues to grow at the pace it has in the recent past, the number of cars that will be going through that part of town will only increase;

2) the tunnel can be used as a re-enforcement of the actual seawall itself--the added expense and time necessary would be more than made up for simply because the tunnel alternative takes care of both the traffic and the deterioration of the seawall, all in one fell swoop;

3) views from the city can be capitalized--those citizens and visitors who are in Seattle (and not just passing through on the road) can thoroughly enjoy the views of our majestic Olympics--and the area where the Viaduct now stands would be Oh-so-much better if it were a park or public place serving recreational activities, instead of partaking/participating in gridlock and road rage;

4) the noise levels would be reduced considerably if the traffic were below street level--one of my main complaints from participating in the Diabetes walk (which went along the Viaduct) was that I could not hear the person walking next to me along the entire 3mile walk. How bad must the noise be for visitors that are walking along the waterfront? How bad must the vehicle exhaust be? What must they think? What message is getting across, and what are these visitors taking home with them when they return from their Vacation to Seattle?

5) most of Seattle's water-footage--not only that along the Puget Sound--is ringed by roads. It would be so much better to see something green and beautiful next to the water in the touristy areas for a change--more fitting to what we, as a city, want to be.

39

Comment

I think the tunnel alternative is the most desirable.

If the cost of that alternative proves to be too daunting, the bypass tunnel would be a worthy alternative.

The plan advocated by the "take it down, don't rebuild it" group also deserves to be studied. I strongly recommend including this alternative in the final version of the EIS. Having a cost estimate for this option would provide an excellent baseline by which to compare the costs and benefits of the other plans.

As a resident of Fremont I often use the viaduct as an alternative to I-5 or surface roads when traveling through downtown. As much as I love the view I would trade it for a viaduct-free waterfront, even though my personal use of the waterfront is minimal. The noise pollution and imposing mass of the viaduct today is a tremendous blight on what could be the most enjoyable part of our downtown. Quality of life is not limited to commuting experiences. I would be happy to forego my own viaduct travel in order to have a viaduct-free waterfront.

About the view... Clearly Seattleites like their aerial view of Elliott Bay, even if they're stuck in traffic while they enjoy it. I would suggest that an amusement park ride or elevated walkway could be constructed to provide the same or better view to future Seattleites once the viaduct is gone. To rebuild an aerial viaduct in order to preserve the view for drivers strikes me as desperately perverse.

40

Comment

Rebuild Alternative - I appreciate what we have: 1) convenient exits; 2) Views; 3) seamless trip from Spokane St to downtown Seattle.

Aerial Alternative - Probably too expensive - but remember we will this time improve Seattle's livability, business economic growth.

(The surface alternative will stagnate use of all downtown Seattle - just not sensible for a prosperous city.)

41

Comment

Want to see the viaduct kept in some form. I prefer the tunnel alternative but if the money isn't there for the tunnel then rebuild the viaduct as is! DO NOT tear it down and expect 110,000 cars to find an alternative route!

42

Comment

My comment that I would like to make is in regards to who makes the final decision on which of the kinds of transportation or the kind of viaduct that they will build. And I would really like to see it put to a vote of the people in Seattle, because they can come up, usually, with what they want. Not that they are trustworthy, but I would really like to have the people in Seattle vote on the plan that they would prefer. That's all I want to say.

43

Comment

Do funding sources differ per option? Are funds secure for the life of each alternative? What if there are cost overruns?

I prefer the aerial and tunnel alternatives based on future traffic flow and long term integration with the Seattle "look and feel". Given current efforts to increase rail, monorail options for travelers, the viaduct's key client is vehicles. Regardless, consistent efforts to include safe and secure bike lanes both during construction and in the final product are much appreciated. The cost of the tunnel concerns me as does the experience in Boston with the "Big Dig". Efforts to ensure costs and timeline would be strictly adhered too would be important to highlight to the public. The City of Seattle has been successful at encouraging and supporting alternative modes of transportation. Yet the viaduct poses a unique challenge to the city. Fear of what may occur once construction begins could damper and slow progress on this project. Thoughtful, strategic and on-going efforts to mitigate construction should be marketed to both residents and employees. Traditional vanpool, rideshare and other employer based options should be supported but new and innovative ideas on reaching out to residents should be equally considered.

44

Comment

My name is Bruce Fine, and I live on the waterfront. I'm concerned that they have not addresses adequately the notion of having traffic be either eliminated, or substantially impeded, during the construction period. It appears that there's a presumption that traffic needs to continue to flow through this area while construction is going on, as a result of which there are a number of mitigation, temporary measures, and so forth, which extend the construction time and substantially divert resources from the actual project to these temporary mitigation issues.

I would like to see them consider a couple of things. First, there are a number of projects that seem to be sort of ancillary to the main waterfront project, that being Mercer Street and Broad Street, and making sure that those projects get done first, as a means of dealing with additional traffic flow that happened as a result of construction, and then explore other areas or other ways to deal with the increased traffic during construction, other than having it continue to go through that corridor or have built-in measures.

The idea of that is that you constrict the construction time to as small a period of time as possible, and you hopefully make an effort to spread the impact of the construction through a number of neighborhoods and not just the waterfront neighborhood. By minimizing the construction period you save resources and you obviously save the impact of the construction on the waterfront residents, the merchants, and tourists, and all the rest of that.

I have just found out, out in the other room there, that the State of the ferry system has a project for the Coleman Dock that contemplates redoing that, and perhaps redirecting the traffic flow off of the ferry, and I think that they need to address the timing and impact issues as to how that's going to affect what is going on and whether or not some collaboration, some input from this project and that project, so that it gets done first and, again, minimize the impact of the construction on the waterfront community.

There is sort of a corollary to that, and they call it the no action alternative. And I don't know that they've -- I don't feel that they have spent enough time dealing with the impact of that and, actually, the no action alternative is sort of akin to what would we do if there was no traffic flow through this corridor during construction. So, assessing that alternative accomplishes two things. One, can you divert the traffic sufficiently so that perhaps this project doesn't need to be done at all or near the scale that is proposed? Or alternatively, how do you, as I said before, minimize the time for construction and spread the impact of the construction problem through as many neighborhoods as possible?

I also think that there is a deficiency in the consideration of the impact of this construction on the waterfront community that you read things in there about noise and shading and so forth and so on, but there is vibration to the ground, there is pollution, there's particulate matter from both the construction mess and from diverting traffic, and a whole host of other impacts that I don't think have been adequately addressed.

Who is the prototype person that they use when they're trying to assess these impacts? So they assess them against people that are young and healthy, or old and infirm, or children, pets. You know, the variety of living creatures on the waterfront of varying ages and types, I don't think have been adequately evaluated for the effects that this construction would have on them. And so, I would like to see the EIS spend more time on that.

45

Comment

When I came to this meeting I was sure that I wanted the rebuild or aerial alternatives on this project. After looking at the various details I have changed my opinion, I now like the Tunnel Alternative. My main concern about the tunnel alternative is the cost and the greater possibility of cost overruns. My main thoughts about the alternatives is one we can afford and one that will not reduce traffic throughput.

46

Comment

We have gone to several informational meetings about the Alaskan Way viaduct and would like to say that we are in favor of the cut and cover tunnel that extends to Battery. We live on Alaskan Way and certainly think it would be a nicer place without the noise of the viaduct and with the city opening up to the waterfront in a more attractive way.

We would hope that you could avoid having more lanes of traffic on Alaskan Way, so that it would be attractive to visitors, and perhaps the trolley could be moved to Western.

47

Comment

Re-connecting the waterfront and the city are forefront. Drop the wall between Seattle and the Sound. The Viaduct is able to go cut and cover and provide more amenity space for a growing city, why not do this??? Development will pay handsomely for some of the adjacent space. Steve Paoli Sales Manager Cristalla Residences Queen Anne Community Council/Homeowner

48

Comment

The city should drop the highway out of the physical way of the Waterfront and Downtown. More development, both housing and recreation will blossom. The original viaduct was part and parcel of the "build it simple" mentality of the 1950s. What great buildings or public works do we have from that era? Not our Library or City Hall. If we repeat short sighted vision; Seattle will never be a great world class city. Never a Paris, a New York, a London, that years ago dropped transportation out of the daily patchwork of it's citizens lives. Yes, it will cost more, but this is Seattle's shoreline for the next one hundred years.

49

Comment

Replacing the seawall with a full length tunnel is the only sensible option. Doing so will: 1. replace a dangerous, noisy, ugly structure 2. open up the waterfront in a way most of us can't really imagine 3. provide a traffic route able to better handle future traffic needs While arguments have been made for the "scenic" qualities of the existing viaduct, in reality, only passengers can look about when passing over the viaduct, the driver must concentrate on the narrow, dangerous lanes.

50

Comment

I own a business in Pioneer Square. Every day I wonder what kind of idiocy led to the building of the viaduct. It is noisy, extremely ugly and ruins natural beauty that Seattle is blessed with. An underground tunnel would restore the area. Views from buildings would be reopened, making the whole area more desirable. The removal of the noise and dirt from the viaduct would make the location ideal for restaurants with outdoor seating and great views. No true refurbishing or renewal of Pioneer Square, which is the historic heart of Seattle, is possible with the viaduct in its current location. Moving the viaduct will drastically change this area - make it much more friendly to business and tourists. Please, please, please move it underground.

51

Comment

The Environmental Impact Statement should study the no-highway alternative proposed by the People's Waterfront Coalition, including a four-lane surface street, traffic demand management (TDM), and the 21 small and mid-sized projects have been identified by Seattle DOT as components of a decentralized solution to keep traffic flowing without replacing the Viaduct, if it fails before a new highway can be built. This alternative would clearly be lowest cost, would do the most to restore the waterfront, would be best in environmental terms, and would bring the most economic benefit to Seattle. The only question is whether this alternative would work in terms of traffic flow. We will not know the answer to this question unless this alternative is studied in the EIS. Even if the EIS finds that this alternative is not completely adequate, we will get useful information from studying it. For example, finding out how much we can reduce congestion through TDM and through the 21 projects identified by Seattle DOT would be helpful in deciding how much capacity we need if we build the surface boulevard alternative studied in the EIS. It is plausible that, even if the no-highway is not feasible, some hybrid of this alternative and the surface-boulevard alternative is feasible. Again, we will not know unless the no-highway alternative is studied. I urge you to include this alternative in the final EIS. Charles Siegel

Comment

Proposed Elliott Bay Bridge

Imagine a bridge built over Elliott Bay that removes the high speed traffic and noise of highway 99 away from the waterfront and returns the waterfront back to the city of Seattle for development.

Picture a cable-stayed suspension bridge with a main span of 3,450 feet for a total bridge length of 6,900 feet with approaches for a total length of two miles. It can be built within five years at a cost of about one billion dollars. The bridge would be the same length as the Alaskan Way Viaduct and replace it forever.

The bridge's main span is supported by two bridge towers that are approximately 1000 feet above sea level and support the cable stayed bridge span 240 feet above the water.

The towers will have a Viewing/Restaurant platforms at the 800 foot level for the south tower and Security facilities for the Port of Seattle and US Coast guard at the south tower.

The bridge deck has a curved designed into it to allow for expansion and contraction of the superstructure between the approaches and will curve outward from the waterfront to afford a greater space for Seattle to have an Inner Harbor. This curved deck will also move the highway traffic a half mile off the waterfront, far enough away so you can see the vitality of the traffic but not hear it.

The curve in the bridge deck will also allow for the bridge alignment with the Battery Street Tunnel and when traveling north on the bridge the Space Needle will appear centered between the suspension cables and when traveling south (on a good day), Mt. Rainier will appear centered between suspension cables.

The Bridge is designed to support six lanes of car/truck traffic and monorail tracks under the bridge superstructure for a personal rapid transit (PRT) public monorail transportation service to the bridge towers and the cities new waterfront development.

The bridge towers will be mirror like, and at times their silhouettes will disappear and reappear like a mirash with reflections and shadows in the waters of Elliott Bay.

The bridge cable-stayed suspension system is a new and inventive structure and is supported by the two towers anchored approximately 220 feet below the surface of the water by means of a foundation system that will harness the unique geology of the Elliott Bay estuary and resolves the ecological impact of the bridge construction in a new and meaningful way.

The Elliott Bay Bridge will be the longest cable stayed bridge in the world and perhaps a new signature for the City of Seattle.

Some engineers believe the Alaskan Way Viaduct is too dangerous to use and should be shut down. Remember the California Northridge Earthquake of January 17, 1994 and the catastrophic events to the transportation system of L.A.

Now is the time to build!

Roger Patten AIA

53

Comment

Alternatives: Given the visual benefits of the surface, bypass tunnel, or tunnel alternatives, one of these alternatives is the most logical choice. Property values will soar, which will spur residential density in downtown (furthering one of the City's current objectives) and will also attract visitors, shoppers, and tourists to the waterfront and the vicinity. Neighboring areas, e.g. Pioneer Square, West Edge, Belltown, stand to benefit greatly from the removal of an aerial structure, as these areas will enjoy connections to the waterfront. Though the short-term costs may be significant, the long-term gains far outweigh these costs.

Construction Impacts and Mitigation:

Parking --

Throughout the Draft EIS, the loss of parking -- both short- and long-term -- is repeatedly cited as an impact, particularly in Pioneer Square. Mitigation, therefore, should address this loss of parking. The proposed strategies of maximizing utilization of existing facilities, leasing a facility, or buying/building a facility seem reasonable, but given the large number of spaces needing to be replaced, it is likely that a new facility will need to be built. The Pioneer Square community (via the Pioneer Square Community Association) looks forward to working with the AWVSR team to establish appropriate mitigation.

Congestion/Economic Impacts --

Increased traffic congestion also appears frequently in the DEIS. Impacts to businesses, especially small businesses like those in Pioneer Square, will be overwhelmingly negative due to severe impediments to accessing businesses and a resulting projected decrease in sales. Because the project area extends 400 feet from the existing viaduct, the number of businesses to be affected is considerable. (I believe the DEIS identified 1100 businesses within 1 block.) Among mitigation measures, both access to and marketing for these businesses will be essential. With such a lengthy overall construction period (despite the several-month rest periods), many businesses, especially the small, independent ones, will face serious challenges in enduring the years coinciding with construction. Economic development assistance -- including effective traffic detours and visible marketing -- will be necessary for their continued existence, and the Pioneer Square community encourages you to work with us to establish reasonable mitigation for these businesses.

Historic Structures --

In light of the damage that vibration impacts can cause to historic buildings, careful attention must be paid to construction near those buildings. Whenever possible, construction methods that pose the smallest threat to compromising the structural integrity of those buildings should be selected.

Finally, the relocation of the Washington Street Boat Landing is a necessary byproduct of the AWVSR project. Along with this structure's relocation, improvements to the area, e.g. sidewalk improvements should accompany this project so that the area is left in comparable if not better condition than its current state.

Thank you for soliciting public input and for taking the time to review these comments. The Pioneer Square Community Association looks forward to working with you throughout this process.

54

Comment

The opportunity to ease the noise pollution and honor our waterfront is clear. Put transportation if absolutely necessary underground. Fix the seawall. If disruption needs to occur for the seawall it makes sense to put in the cut and cover tunnel. Beyond the need for thru traffic and freight leave the surface grand and glorious with out visual and noise distractions and degrading.

55

Comment

We believe that the Pike Place Market is situated in a key geographical location, providing a critical link between the Central Business District and the Waterfront. Currently we are one of the few locations along the corridor where the public can find assisted access to and from the Waterfront. We were disappointed that the tunnel option includes replacement of an aerial structure from Pine to Battery to access the existing tunnel at Battery. We ask for further exploration of lidding the structure from Pine (at the Southwest corner of the PC-1 site) to at least past the northwest corner of Victor Steinbruek Park. Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

Comment

The project is too ambitious and too expensive. It appears to place expansion as the overriding goal. Intermediate access points have proven to decrease capacity and safety and should be eliminated. Two alternatives not studied should be considered given the lack of financing: 1. The No-highway alternative which would eliminate the central portion of the project and substitute other smaller components including enhanced transit service on monorail and LINK and new expanded streetcar service. 2. Removing the top deck; adding new columns just outboard of the existing columns; widening the remaining (current lower deck) to a four lane facility with center barrier (total of 72 feet overall) [2'wall+8'brkdn+2x11'lanes+2'shldr+2'barrier]x2 These would be through lanes with no access from Battery to Jackson. Make Alaska a boulevard by shifting NB Alaska to under the viaduct; double streetcar track; bike lanes; shift trail to water side; on-street parking on both sides. The elevated would be the bi-pass. Local access from Alaska. Monorail serving local Ballard and W Seattle to downtown. Link serving mid-regional N Seattle and Airport/Burien to downtown. Add \$ to both rail systems for additional track to make additional connections such as the airport and Northgate. This project needs to have an affordable option that does not destroy the waterfront. These proposed options place increased dependence on new rail system, which is funded, for intermediate trips.

57

Comment

26 April 2004

Allison Ray
DOT Environmental Coordinator
Alaskan Way Viaduct and Seawall Replacement Project
999 Third Avenue - Suite 2424
Seattle, WA 98104

Friends:

I have been thinking on this problem for 35 years and also following the discussions. I had more or less decided it was a case of an "insolvable problem" until I read the article in the Seattle Times 1 April 2004. The sad thing is that none of the alternatives seems to be really satisfactory for anyone.

After all these years it came to me - with a little lateral thinking - that there is a good solution which is simple, elegant, workable, timely, environmentally reasonable, and affordable (I think). Attached is a drawing with map and explanation. Many famous harbors have bridges.

I am aware of all the detail design, engineering, planning, and environmental studies which would be necessary - after 65 years of doing those things myself - and I think it is doable. For example, T.Y. Lin is capable of doing the structural engineering I believe.

Consider also the Thompson Freeway: why it was panned and why it was canceled.

What do you think? It seems to me the people of the city and the state should at least be aware of this option.

Attachment:

Advantages to the "Seattle Gateway Bridge" Solution to the Alaskan Way Viaduct problem.

1. The existing viaduct is completely removed from the waterfront allowing the best development for its use.
2. Can be almost entirely constructed without interrupting present traffic on route 99.
3. Can be built on a fast track construction schedule, proceeding 24/7, taking possibly half the time of the other schemes.
4. Pending solid construction bids, the cost should be equal to or less than the lowest cost alternative, particularly when factoring in the minimum interruption and earlier completion date.
5. Provides a true alternative route around/thru the downtown to supplement I-5 Freeway.
6. Rather than blocking views of the Olympics and the water would frame them. The view for motorists would be enhanced.
7. Would add to the city's magic with a beautiful gateway.
8. No comparison with the projections for "travel times; average speed; or loss of parking."
9. Could reasonably be made a toll bridge to help pay the cost. One time users - i.e. tourists - full price, commuters a minimum amount. Occasional resident users somewhere in between.

A diagram was also drawn on the page.

58

Comment

As a volunteer Board of Director's member I would like to express my following opinion: It is imperative to me that the Viaduct Committee assist the Casa Latina organization with employment opportunities for this group of displaced workers by employing them in the construction of the viaduct project. Secondly, we are in desperate need of financial support for the relocation of this group of people to a location that is convenient to contractors. Your assistance is truly necessary Sincerely, Bryon S. Peterson, President, HR Group International

59

Comment

Casa Latina has a workers/laborers program and is located on Western Ave. Due to the viaduct program/reconstruction we are obliged to relocate the workers center. Your assistance is critical to continuation of this non-profit organization.

60

Comment

The existing viaduct is over capacity, frequent accidents occur on the southbound lanes in front of our location at Main Street. Last week a collision sent ten pound pieces of viaduct raining down on cars and people. This will continue to be a problem with any elevated structure. The risk to people and property from objects emanating from elevated structures needs to be studied. Historic buildings should be protected through construction of any alternative with the historic connections to the waterfront enhanced. Noise needs to be diminished as much as possible in the downtown area and for that reason the tunnel alternative has additional merit. The long term growth and livability prospects for Seattle is better with the tunnel alternative.

61

Comment

please consider adding another option for central waterfront area with features of the bypass tunnel and surface options. In that segment, place the lanes going only one direction below grade and build the lanes going the other direction on a deck at grade with a concrete box around them. Atop the concrete box new slow local streets and pedestrian ways would be constructed. Sloped ramps would connect the top of the box with both the water and city sides of the box. Consider the redevelopment of the concrete boxes in Paris on either bank of the Seine. On the right bank, there is an express roadway. On the left bank, there is an RER line. On both sides there are pedestrian facilities on top. Some streets would connect Western Avenue with the top of the box. Others would lead to pedestrian ramps. Should free up more land for redevelopment. Would retain advantage of tunnel options to share concrete wall with seawall reconstruction.

62

Comment

The time value of money coupled with rising fuel costs will increase the actual cost of this project no matter which alternative is selected. Lets see about moving the final alternative selection date up and save the tax payers.

63

Comment

Allison

I commented in the PDEIS. The DEIS appeared to be the same document with better visuals. Thus my comments on the PDEIS should apply to the DEIS. In fact I did not notice any of my comments on the PDEIS addressed in the DEIS. Therefore, I believe that my comments on the PDEIS should be relevant to the DEIS. Please accept this e-mail as my formal response to your request.

Cheers,
Bob Donnelly

Please note: Contact Allison Ray at 206-382-5230 if you would like a copy of the PDEIS comments.

64

Comment

Few times in the life of a great city does it get the opportunity to really do something right and good for the community. There is only one option for replacing the viaduct that will stand the test of time and criticism: a full cut and cover tunnel. It will relieve a wonderful waterfront of the horrible din of an overhead freeway and make Seattle a world-class city, like it deserves to be.

65

Comment

Given the numerous factors involved in the decision-making process and the analysis illustrated in the summary and comparison of alternatives... The alternative with the highest and best value for the City of Seattle's transportation system, the citizens of Seattle, and tourists is the Tunnel Alternative. Although this Alternative is the most costly, it's other advantages outweigh the costs. The Tunnel Alternative would provide the fewest impacts to views and noise, which is a constant concern in downtown and along the waterfront. Tourists and citizens would be more interested in visiting the waterfront if there was less noise and more views. Consequently, the waterfront businesses would benefit economically from the Tunnel Alternative. Also, the waterfront would provide more of a civic experience and center for Seattle. Traffic speeds under the Tunnel Alternative are near the top, comparable with the Aerial Alternative. The Surface Alternative would worsen transportation and circulation through downtown, given the traffic speeds, impacts to other adjacent roadways, and congestion at nearby intersections. Safety is worst under the Surface Alternative, which should be a significant decision-making issue. Bypass Tunnel rates low on safety as well. The number of buildings, employees, and acres are most impacted by the Surface Alternative. The number of cubic yards to be excavated poses the question- where will it be moved under the Tunnel Alternative? When it comes to individual preference about what type of structure to build- I think it is best to weigh cumulative impacts- both positive and negative for the majority of people in the area. This means considering people who work in nearby buildings, take the ferry, tourists and pedestrians, drivers along SR99 and adjacent roads. As a result, drivers along SR99 are but a fraction of the total number of people affected. While views from the Viaduct are a legitimate benefit, the Viaduct conversely blocks views along the entire waterfront and is a noisy distraction to the beautiful scenery and pedestrian experience along the waterfront. The Surface Alternative is the least desirable, for many of the reasons stated above. Most importantly, it is the worst alternative because it decreases roadway capacity by 60%!!!! For the good of Seattle, its citizens, and visitors, please DO NOT select this alternative. The most viable alternatives are the Tunnel and Bypass Tunnel after being analyzed considering a variety of factors. However, the Tunnel is preferable because of its fewer impacts on noise, higher traffic speeds, less traffic on Alaska Way, better safety, fewer congested intersections in adjacent areas, and overall character of the waterfront!

Comment

I fully support the Tunnel alternative (Bypass would be a distant second). The Tunnel alternative has many distinct advantages:

- 1) Most important it respects Seattle's most precious asset - the waterfront.
- 2) It allows the surface to be a lower speed European style boulevard with local traffic, and could incorporate broad pedestrian promenades, landscaping with street trees, bike lanes, etc.
- 3) Opens wonderful views and connections between cityscape and water.
- 4) Through traffic is accommodated at higher speed in tunnel.

Comment

To: Allison Ray

Alaskan Way Viaduct and Seawall Replacement Project Office

June 1, 2004

I'm a resident of the Montlake neighborhood of Seattle and a member of various committees including the SR-520 Advisory Committee and the SR-520 Local Impact Committee. The following are my personal comments in response to the draft EIS.

Obviously, we would have to be crazy to spend anything close to the same amount of money and three more years to construct an aerial structure on the central waterfront in the 21st century, so I won't waste any ink on that option. Widening First Avenue through Pioneer Square would be an unacceptable impact; that area, including the areaways below, is a cherished treasure of the city. A 6 lane Alaskan Way on a huge right of way much of which is given over to pedestrian, bicycle and park space, however, would not be so bad. The splendid Champs Elysees in Paris has eight lanes, and there isn't even a waterfront or much of a city skyline to look at. Other examples of large scale and hugely successful boulevards are all over the world from Berlin to Barcelona and beyond. Nevertheless, there is no disputing that these all entail a significant inconvenience to pedestrians, which can be somewhat mitigated in this case by pedestrian overpasses such as the one that exists today to the ferry terminal. Some creative landscape architecture could integrate widened pedestrian overpasses into new developments; we could work with the sloped topography to the East instead of ignoring it. The visioning efforts by the Cascadia Project at the Discovery Institute should be examined closely. We need to ask whether we should be wedded to the historic piers in their current location, which do cut us off from the waterfront. Many of them contain tourist shops that could be anywhere there is retail space and a large tourist population; they are not intrinsically connected to the waterfront as a waterfront.

Regarding our transportation needs, it's worth asking why, if we are able to deal with a 2 lane AWW (during peak hours) and closure in off hours for many years during the construction phase, as the draft EIS suggests, then why couldn't we continue to deal with that scenario on an ongoing basis? We need to evaluate the cost/benefit of these large build options before committing to huge public funding. What are the plans to deal with the contingency of the AWW becoming unavailable before this project is completed due to an act of nature, and why aren't those plans incorporated into this EIS? How effective would we anticipate them to be? Before we commit to spending three billion dollars, can we conduct a "test" by closing the Viaduct temporarily and implementing this plan to see how effective it really is? This would not be a definitive answer due to the temporary nature of the closure, but would definitely be enlightening and would prove a worthwhile proof of concept of our contingency plans in any case.

If we were starting from scratch today (and in some sense, we are), would we really think to construct a new 4 or 6 lane highway on our waterfront? Who really uses the Viaduct today and what other means are available for them to get where they need to go? The draft EIS does not contain enough information on origins and destinations of today's AWW users and a comparison of how these constituencies would gain or lose from the various alternatives.

The reason the Viaduct is there is that SR-99 was the main north-south artery before I-5 was constructed. Now that we have I-5 (and have had it for forty years), SR-99 has been relegated to connecting Westside districts of Seattle. We're building a monorail connecting Ballard and West Seattle to downtown. There is an adjacent body of water which carries one of the largest ferry systems in the world. The waterfront streetcar could be expanded to a higher capacity system as one finds along the waterfront in Lisbon, Portugal. It does seem like there are other options besides just a highway here especially when we don't have the money to replace it in hand. Vancouver, BC never built urban freeways and downtown traffic has actually decreased following the influx of a huge residential population in entire new neighborhoods beautiful condominium towers. Its waterfront is a green, blue, dynamic and wonderful place. Admittedly, Vancouver is not an isthmus like Seattle. But perhaps there is a smaller option than the highway options that are currently under consideration that makes sense. Long haul trips are on I-5. Commute trips to downtown ought to be largely on public transit in the long term, including monorail and light rail and any other future transportation investments such as a PRT (Personal Rapid Transit) network, and no ramps on the central waterfront need be constructed. Would a two lane tunnel option with electronic tolling (and toll levels set for network efficiency) be effective for through trips? Why is there no option in between the surface option and a 4 lane underground highway?

I'm not sure I buy the dire predictions of what would happen if Alaskan Way and I-5 if the Viaduct were closed. Without a dramatic change in the price of oil or tolling policy, I-5 will be a parking lot for the foreseeable future regardless of what happens with AWW. I'm sure some traffic would be diverted if capacity on AWW were reduced, but I would anticipate that a large chunk of the traffic would simply go away as it did in San Francisco when the Embarcadero came down. I remember what that was like beforehand – a dark, noisy and forbidding place – and the area is now a major attraction. That transformation, borne out of the tragedy of the 1989 earthquake, is truly inspiring. Seattle has the benefit of learning from its own mistakes and the successes of our west coast neighbors of San Francisco, Portland and Vancouver in either never constructing or removing urban freeways.

I'm not wild about a large new aerial structure heading to the Battery Street Tunnel with corresponding noise and visual impacts (particularly at the Market and Victor Steinbrueck Park) but it appears there's no way to get rid of that as long as there is any highway south from there. In light of that, I would favor as making this aerial structure as small and unobtrusive as is practicable. A six lane tunnel really seems like overkill when the Battery Street Tunnel is only 4 lanes and rarely seems congested. The AWW is eight lanes in some segments today, but these lanes are so substandard that I believe it carries well below what a six lane freeway built to modern standards would be able to carry.

North of the Battery Street Tunnel, it is critical to do something to connect the ever-popular Seattle Center (which will soon gain a monorail station closer to Aurora) and 50 acres of new development in South Lake Union, which may soon gain a streetcar as well as a grand new waterfront park. The traffic congestion on Denny, which is a major bus route connecting Queen Anne and Capitol Hill, is unbearable and additional crossings of Aurora are required to solve that problem. A widened, two-way Mercer Boulevard is the right solution in South Lake Union, and this needs to interface in a rational way with Aurora Ave. Ideally, Aurora would be below grade, but an overpass at Thomas and widened Mercer would help. I won't miss the Broad Street underpass which is extremely unpleasant and hazardous to walk or bicycle through, and divides land parcels in this area into unattractive little triangles and other odd shapes. The aesthetics of the Broad Street undercrossing resemble the abandoned freeway project that I believe it is. Driving directions from the Mercer exit on I-5 to Queen Anne are incredibly convoluted today and no-one in their right mind would design it this way from scratch. Signals on Aurora are found to the north, near Green Lake, and should not be considered anathema. Perhaps a reconnected network in which Aurora is turned from limited access highway back into a major arterial on this stretch would actually work well to distribute traffic so the impacts are not too high in any one spot. That scenario deserves to be analyzed thoroughly with a traffic microsimulation for all modes that looks at every intersection in the area assuming full build out of new development and other transportation infrastructure many years hence.

thank you,

Jonathan Dubman

2014 E Calhoun St.

Seattle, WA 98112

68

Comment

With a large business in West Seattle, one major concern is level of traffic disruption getting to and from West Seattle. After reviewing the information provided at the Public Hearing, I would be in support of the Tunnel alternative. My primary reasons include disruption, duration, and the preferred final projects advantages for improving the waterfront.

Comment

May 25, 2004

Allison Ray
WSDOT Environmental Coordinator
Alaskan Way Viaduct and Seawall Replacement Project
999 Third Avenue, Suite 2424
Seattle, WA 98104

Dear Ms. Ray,

We appreciate the opportunity to submit comment in connection with the Construction Impacts and Mitigations of the Viaduct and Seawall Replacement Project.

McKinnon Furniture is a locally owned and operated company started in 1990 and employing 29 people in the Seattle area with revenues in excess of \$3,000,000 per year. We are currently located at 1015 Western Avenue but we will be moving to a new space in September at 1201 Western Avenue in which we will occupy over 11,000 square feet. Our staff and revenues will grow accordingly. We are one of many businesses who will be directly affected by this project.

The two major areas of concern, regardless of the replacement project ultimately selected, are parking and accessibility.

Parking is already a problem in our neighborhood and will become a truly critical issue regardless of the replacement project ultimately selected. If not fully addressed, customers will avoid the neighborhood and take their business to the suburbs.

- It is important that when meters are removed to accommodate construction, that they are replaced elsewhere, including in lots if necessary.
- We would also suggest a program of some free parking, such as two hours in certain lots.
- It is equally important to have an adequate budget for promotions of the neighborhood, coupons for free parking redeemable at merchants, and for marketing the parking programs.

Accessibility is the second issue. If parking is available but traffic is still impeded, people will shop elsewhere. Even the perception that the area is hard to reach will keep customers away. Therefore, it is important to keep traffic flowing and to again have a budget to aggressively promote this fact.

We are more than willing to work with you if you want feedback on the best way to address these critical issues. The livelihoods of a number of businesses and employees depend on how these issues are addressed.

Thank you for your consideration.

Regards,

Sheila McKinnon
President

Theresa Schneider
Vice President

70

Seattle's Home Furnishing District
1015 Western Avenue
Seattle, WA 98104

May 27, 2004

Allison Ray
WSDOT Environmental Coordinator
Alaskan Way Viaduct & Seawall Replacement Project
999 Third Avenue, Suite 2424
Seattle, WA 98104

Dear Ms. Ray,

The Western Avenue Merchants Association was created in 2001 in an effort to represent the interests of the home furnishings businesses in the area between Yesler and Battery Streets and Western Avenue and Second Avenue. We represent 20 companies who will be directly affected by the Viaduct and Seawall Replacement Project. We appreciate the opportunity to submit comments.

The two major areas of concern to our members, regardless of the replacement project ultimately selected, are the availability of parking and accessibility to the neighborhood.

Parking is already a significant issue in our neighborhood and will become a truly critical one regardless of the replacement project ultimately selected. If not fully addressed, customers will simply avoid the neighborhood and take their business to the suburbs.

- It is important that when meters are removed to accommodate construction, that they are replaced elsewhere, including in lots if necessary.
- We would also suggest a program of some free parking, such as two hours in certain lots.
- It is equally important to have an adequate budget for promotions of the neighborhood, coupons for free parking redeemable at merchants, and for marketing the parking program.

Accessibility is the second issue requiring full consideration. If parking is available but traffic is restricted, we will lose our customers. Even the perception that the area is hard to reach will keep customers away. Therefore, it is important to keep traffic flowing and to again have an adequate budget to aggressively promote accessibility.

The business of the Western Avenue Merchants Association would be more than willing to work with you to provide feedback on the best way to address these issues that are critical to our survival. The livelihoods of a number of businesses and employees depend on how these issues are addressed.

Thank you for your consideration.

Regards,

Theresa Schneider
President, Western Avenue Merchants Association

Member Companies:
Continental Furniture
Thomasville Home Furnishings of Puget Sound
It's Gotta Go
La-Z-Boy Comfort Center
Ligne Roset
Mandarin Asian Antiques
Inform Interiors
Swedish Heirlooms
McKinnon Furniture
Brasswoods Furniture
Deep Interior
LaBrash Fine Oriental Carpets
Modele's consignment Home Furnishings

Big People Toys Asian Antiques
Arte Forma Designs
Mitchell Gold @ HOUSE
Dania
Fine Furniture Gallery
Iron Design Center

71

Comment

My name is Dan Banchiu, B-a-n-c-h-i-u. I'm a general manager at the Marriott Hotel on Alaskan Way, Seattle Waterfront.

First of all, I want to say that I was surprised and quite disappointed there wasn't a formal hearing on this so we all can hear each others points of view.

Additionally, I've been looking at some of the documents, and I didn't think it adequately reflected the true state of the business and the affect it would have on those businesses. So, that concerned me quite a bit.

Additionally, we just invested \$90-million to redevelop the waterfront, and I'm here to protect that. We were led to believe for the last 10 years that the waterfront was going to be redeveloped, and we joined in on that whole thing, and now there's some, how do I say, some renderings, that reflect the viaduct will now be in front of the hotel, and that will just strategically affect my business to the detriment.

72

Comment

In the big picture, the difference in cost between rebuilding the viaduct, putting it at street level or putting it in a tunnel is not all that great.

In the big picture, the benefits to putting it in a tunnel are enormous:
moves through traffic through
keeps local traffic local
dramatically reduces noise and pollution
opens up the waterfront to downtown views and viewing
opens up the waterfront facing properties to development
opens up the waterfront to tourism and general enjoyment
It's clear: for our 50 year future, it's worth it to put the viaduct in a tunnel.

Comment

RE: Potential Alternate Elevations and Routing for the Alaska Way Viaduct Replacement Tunnel Alternative

Dear Ms. Sullivan:

As a follow-up to participating in the City's Waterfront Charrette, The MAKERS + Friends team would like to draw your attention to two ideas regarding the Alaska Way Viaduct Tunnel Alternative:

1. An alternate elevation between Pike/Pine and the Battery Street Tunnel.
2. Routing the northbound lanes under Western Avenue.

Alternative Elevation between Pike/Pine and Battery Streets

In the existing Tunnel Alternative, SR 99 surfaces between Pike and Pine and continually increases in elevation to provide adequate clearance over the Railroad, Elliott, and Western Avenues.

Our team suggest tunneling underneath Elliott and Western Avenues rather than crossing these arterials as an elevated structure, as shown in the following illustration. (Our alternative would not affect the elevation gain required for Railroad clearance). *A picture/diagram was included in the written comment*

We believe tunneling under Elliot and Western Avenues better aligns with the City's Central Waterfront Plan goals and would provide the following advantages:

- Improve the visual and physical connection between downtown and the waterfront.
- Provide development opportunities on the blocks occupied by and adjacent to the existing and currently proposed elevated structure.
- Increase tax base revenues available to the City of Seattle.
- Improve driving conditions by decreasing the SR 99 road slope to 5% grade after railroad clearance.

This option places SR 99 at a lower elevation at the Battery Street Tunnel entrance and would likely require reworking the portion of the tunnel between Battery Street and Second Avenue. Although this (and other potential issues) could increase this option's costs, we believe its potential advantages warrant its consideration.

Routing Northbound Lanes under Western Avenue

The Tunnel Alternative currently follows the approximate route of the existing Alaskan Way Viaduct and will require closing the existing viaduct during some construction phases. As is illustrated, our team suggests placing the northbound lanes in a tunnel under Western Avenue, which has the potential to improve construction phasing, on-off-ramp alignment, and overall road slope.

(An illustration was included with this statement)

Thank you for considering our suggestions to improve the Alaska Way Viaduct Tunnel Alternative. Do not hesitate to contact us if you need more information or would like to discuss this further.

Sincerely,

Julie Bassuk and Pietro Potesta
MAKERS + Friends, Seattle Central Waterfront Charrette Team 7

Comment

Alaskan Way Viaduct Draft EIS

Attn: Allison Ray WSDOT, Megan Hall, Federal Highway Administration

The attach petitions signed by over one hundred citizens from the Magnolia and Ballard community agree with State Representative Helen Sommers that the BEST alternatives will be the Re-build or the new Aerial.

The petitioners agree that two of the three of the Alternatives are NOT feasible. The all surface Boulevard would be a rush hour nightmare for commuters, business and industry traffic. The four-lane tunnel would eliminate the north portal which is access from Elliott Ave and exit to Western Ave. and therefore, be closed to all traffic to or from the Regrade, Magnolia, Queen Anne, Interbay, Ballard and further north, including industry along the canal. The six-lane tunnel shows the north portal as an option, not included in the basic design and cost the most.

The petitioners believe only the Aerial and Re-build has the same capacity as the present Viaduct. Capacity should not be reduced, as this will further gridlock I-5 and city streets.

In addition to the petitions, it is my personal opinion that the removal of the viaduct for development will gridlock the city in the name of transportation. It should be noted that Seattle ranks in the highest for gridlock of all major cities in the USA.

The EIS process...."WHO WILL DECIDE WHAT WILL REPLACE THE VIADUCT"....has been compromised by special interest groups.

1. The draft regional transportation package as reported in the Seattle Times twice, on January 22, 2004, "Alaskan Way Viaduct: \$1.1 Billion, mostly to replace Viaduct south of King St. with surface roadway".....April 30th 2004 has "\$1 Billion dollars for the Alaskan Way Viaduct. The Viaduct will be replaced between Holgate and South King Street with surface road."
2. The EIS comment period is not complete until the first of June 2004. I believe this predetermination on the viaduct future is a violation of the rules of law and the EIS process.
3. Mayor Greg Nickels has publicly promoted the development of Seattle Waterfront without an Alaskan Way Viaduct. Mayor Greg Nickels shows his Bias and should withdraw from the decisions of the Alaskan Way Viaduct alternatives process.
4. Federal and State transportation funds should not be used in an unfair process to take away or diminish this vital Viaduct corridor from the people of Seattle.

Sincerely,

Eugene Hoglund

Attached was the petition mentioned above with 119 signatures.

Comment

My name is Max Foster. I live at 2549 - 24th Avenue West, in Seattle, which is the Magnolia neighborhood. I've lived in Seattle since 1988. Before that, I lived in Alaska.

I love Seattle, and even when I lived in Alaska, I always enjoyed visiting Seattle. One of my favorite areas to visit was the waterfront. I fell in love with it before I ever moved here. Since I moved here I've enjoyed, immensely, living in Magnolia. My business is located in Magnolia, however, we have customers all over Puget Sound. Many of our customers are in West Seattle and Renton, and for our business we frequently visit those customers, we use the viaduct, we consider Highway 99 a vital transportation link for us. I-5 is not a good substitute for that, so we consider whatever it takes to make Highway 99 a viable transportation artery, and to continue to be that, is an important priority for government and for citizens of Seattle, King County, and Washington State.

I will say my background has been working in utilities and transportation, and I currently own a computer services company. When I worked in utilities I did feasibility studies for two hydroelectric projects that were built in Alaska. One was tie Tyee Lake, and the one was Terror Lake. I also worked on a hydroelectric project that was not built, called the Susitna Project. Having been through that experience, I know the great benefits from the projects that were built, and I know the opportunity that was missed by the project that was not built.

As a citizen of Seattle, I believe that taking the same road of not building the correct transportation artery for the viaduct replacement will have the same impact as not building the Susitna hydro project. It will be a great opportunity lost for the citizenry of Seattle, as well as Washington State.

I also, when I moved to Seattle worked on the Metro Tunnel project and the West Point Treatment Plant project, secondary treatment project, doing cash management when employed at Metro. I know about building large projects, and I know what it takes in terms of the financing and the resources to do those projects. It seems to me that I'd like to make four points on my testimony here on that. One is, many people are saying right now that we don't have the money to spend or we don't want to spend this money on doing this project, or we want to do the least amount of spending on this project. Most those people who are pleading that we can't afford to do this have their own priorities. Many of them are supporting Light Rail, many of them are supporting the Monorail. Some of them just want to plead the need to cut taxes or to keep taxes down. I believe that pleading poverty is an attempt to stop the argument for doing the right thing about the viaduct replacement, without really ever allowing the arguments or the merits for all the different alternatives to be considered.

I also think that it's absolutely not true that we can't afford the project. In fact, we have both the tax base and the revenue to afford it, and I can say this from having looked at all the various bond rating agencies' criteria, and certainly a \$4-billion dollar project or a \$2-billion dollar project could be afforded easily by the citizenry of Seattle, Kind County, and the State of Washington. We have the tax base, we also have the opportunity to use non tax financing, as in tolls, for instance. All of those could certainly pay for this project over a reasonable period, 30, 40 or even 50 years for financing.

My second point, the most expensive option is usually not considered to be the best case. In many projects people look for the lowest cost option. However, in this case the most expensive option appears to be the best option. And when we say the most expensive, I mean the most expensive up front cost. In this case we're talking about spending \$4-billion to build a tunnel to replace the aerial viaduct. The other options, the aerial option and the surface option, have some real deficiencies, whereas the tunnel provides a great opportunity, not only to meet the transportation problem, which it does quite well, and actually provides better than any other alternative for future transportation growth, but it also fixes the problem of the Seawall, which needs to be replaced, and frees up the space currently occupied by the viaduct. This permits the expansion and development of the waterfront.

The aerial option would maintain the same dominance that the current viaduct has over the land, and will actually cause the transportation problem to not be improved. We still will have to replace the Seawall, regardless of whether we do the aerial option or a tunnel option.

The surface option actually exacerbates the transportation problem. It also dominates the land, actually, in a much worse way than the aerial option does. Worse, it cuts off the waterfront from the rest of the city, causing that area to become potentially an economically wasted area.

In addition, the aerial option and the surface option actually lend themselves to earthquake vulnerability, as that area is a fill area, and only by building a strong, secure Seawall and proper foundations can we ensure that that area is not subject to immense earthquake damage.

I would say the bypass tunnel is also insufficient in that the capacity of the tunnel is just not worth the cost. If we're going to build a tunnel, we might as well do it right and build the full tunnel.

My third point is we have an opportunity to develop a waterfront neighborhood. The Mayor of the City of Seattle has exercised leadership in this area, has been conducting a community based effort to look at how we could develop and strengthen the waterfront neighborhood and develop strong ties with both the Downtown and the Belltown neighborhoods.

In addition, we can also provide for the stadiums in providing parking and enhanced use of the stadium areas, along with building a central area for community activates in

the area vacated by the old viaduct when it's torn down.

What we need is a framework for financing this project. First of all, we can and should receive federal highway funds. Second, we should look to revenue bond findings. We can do this by securing the bonds through toll collection and by establishing a local improvement district for all the businesses which would benefit greatly in the area of the waterfront. In this we should be liberal. We should look all the way up to businesses on Second Avenue, down to the waterfront, in establishing the local improvement district.

Finally, we should look at some general obligation bond financing, which would include property tax and vehicle licensing tax revenue, as the basis for the general obligation bond financing.

I also want to conclude by saying that I was privileged at one time to listen to Extra Soloman, who is a tremendous Ph.D. economist, who talked about projects such as the viaduct replacement project. And he pointed out that frequently when doing these projects people tend to overlook the extraneous costs of doing a particular alternative, and also overlook some of the benefits. He called these spill-outs and spill-ins. In the case of most of the options, there's a tremendous spill-in for the project, in terms of the aerial options or the surface option or even the bypass tunnel, and that is that they not only do not directly solve the transportation unit, but they don't lend themselves to developing the community. There's a tremendous spill-out from the project, in a positive way, in terms of the tunnel, where it does allow us to greatly promote our community and to build a strong Downtown, Belltown and waterfront area, in addition to providing for the transportation of today and tomorrow.

And so, I hope that those people who are deciding upon how to do this project and on which options to proceed, do not get caught up in a bigger type philosophy of "We can't afford it." We absolutely can afford it, and we absolutely should, in this case, build the most high cost alternative, which is the tunnel. Thank you.

76

Comment

All right. My name is Bob Messina, M-e-s-s-i-n-a. I live at 1301 North 90th Street. I come down to Alaskan Way for recreation via Myrtle Edwards Park, and I often walk the waterfront all the way to King Street Station.

After seeing the various options for replacing the viaduct, my concern is to keep as much traffic off of Alaskan Way in the future as possible. Therefore, from all of these alternatives, the plan that keeps the most traffic off of Alaskan Way is the full tunnel option. Even though it's listed as the most expensive, it is not terribly much higher than the other options. So, I wholeheartedly support the tunnel option because it, first of all, keeps more traffic off of Alaskan Way and, secondly, it opens up all of the green spaces and park blocks for pedestrians, and the bicycle lanes, and much wider sidewalks. So, that plan I'm recommending, as one voter tonight.

77

Comment

None of these alternatives offered takes full advantage of this incredible opportunity for Seattle. The Alaskan Way Viaduct has cut Seattle off from its waterfront since the 1950's. The end of its useful life offers us a chance to remedy one of the worst urban planning decisions in Seattle's history, and reclaim our connection to Elliott Bay. Other cities around the globe have recognized and remedied similar mistakes, to the current and long-term benefit of their communities. I believe that the City of Seattle and the Central Puget Sound region will be more vital and more successful if we do not build a new highway along Seattle's central waterfront.

Improvements to the larger transportation system -- arterial connections, the express lanes and entrances and exits on I-5, the downtown grid -- and to transit would allow us to accommodate Viaduct freight and car traffic with existing resources. This simpler and more efficient approach offers us the mobility we need at a cost we can afford, without a decade of disruption to businesses and residents, and the billion dollar liabilities of a megaproject. We should not give up our city's most valuable ecological, civic, and economic land for just a highway. We have a once in a century chance to do better, and we owe it to ourselves and our children to be rethink the way we provide stewardship to Seattle's waterfront. Therefore, I urge you to include a "no-highway" alternative in the Viaduct EIS, to spread the traffic out onto existing resources and open up the larger possibilities for the shore.

78

Comment

North Seattle Industrial Association will submit detailed comments by June 1, 2004. We are concerned that the project choose an alternative that is fundable (in the real world), not over-loaded with extras! We are also interested in how trucks will move both during and after Reconstruction!

Rebuild working on the two most fractured sections ASAP - longterm replace one section at a time. We need to get going, funding is light people are at risk if we wait any longer. Also, need to keep truck flowing!

79

Comment

Questions 1. Through 3 comments are as follows:

1. My first comment is: This "project" has an extremely broad impact. The time required to carry it out (4 to seven estimated depending on alternatives and sub-alternatives selected). Will critically impact the dense urban zone in downtown Seattle and the corridors of transportation extending both north and south several miles. The General Public beneficiaries and the private businesses and property owners, and all the various levels of government are affected for the estimated four to seven years of construction, and beyond.

Therefore, I respectfully request that during the Draft EIS evaluation stage, prior to issuing your results of EIS comments, that you consider re-naming the "project" to call it a 'PROGRAM' instead of a "project." That change would more fully imply the large scope and complexity and extensive time required and impacts on all persons traversing the area, to complete the detailed designs, carry out the program, and achieve the objectives and end results determined by the EIS over the life of the "program". The "program" should produce broad beneficial results for all, which results we may happily live with and within and improve upon for perhaps another 100 years or more.

2. I recommend the "Tunnel Alternative". I believe this to be the best combination of choices to achieve results which will enhance many aspects of competing uses of both Seattle and King County residents, downtown real property and business property owners, and visitors to the area for travel and international business with proper engineering and cost evaluation trade studies and use analysis, especially the sequence of construction phases. I believe the Broad Street detour has the best prospects of solving some of the north area issues and construction times.

3. I believe a great deal more time, money and attention should be given to the issues of transit corridors, and various modes of transit, particularly to the METRO transit issues and solutions. Please look at automated driverless PRT systems for congested area, such as the Morgantown W.V. University system for interconnecting the peak hour transit demands, and the large event people moving tasks at events such as football, baseball, cruise ship traffic, and ferry traffic and university and hospital needs for connection.

80

Comment

Great opportunity to restore Central Waterfront from visual eyesore. Also reduce noise pollution. Build the Tunnel!!

81

Comment

To Whom it May Concern:

I love the idea of making our waterfront more reflective of the international cosmopolitan city we have become. Our waterfront is the front door to millions of visitors every year, not to mention those of us living here. I commend your visionary approach to an old problem.

Several ideas I have heard for its redevelopment which I strongly support include the following:

- 1) Moving the trolley car to Western Avenue would provide much better access both to the waterfront, Pike Place Market and our mid-center shopping areas. As is, it is a very inefficient set up for both visitors and those of us living here year round.
- 2) Creating a pedestrian friendly park-like area for all Seattle residents and visitors alike.
- 3) Move viaduct underground to make best use of space

Thank you for your consideration.

Roberta Ohno
ITEC America, Inc.
216 First Avenue South, Suite 251
Seattle, WA 98104
Tel: (206) 223-1802
Fax: (206) 223-1804
roberta.ohno@itec-america.com

82

Comment

My name is Phil Acosta and I'm representing the I.N.L.W.U.

I have some concerns about the viaduct project. One of them is to maintain a high volume access to Terminal 46, both during construction, and a permanent infrastructure to support a world class container terminal for the future. I have some issues involving the prospect of realigning the viaducts to Utah Street. I think that putting those viaducts, approaches from the south side, for just north of Spokane Street, to the current study area, behind the east of the current rail yard, the Sig yard, I think if we could realign there it would allow the Port and the B.N. Sig yard to work much closer and clearer capacity. You could discharge the container ships at the what's now Pier 30 and Pier 25 and move that cargo freely into that Sig yard area, without having the impedance of the low level viaduct that comes off of Spokane Street there.

Approximately 1300 jobs are affected directly with the Terminal 46 area. And if you look here in the Seattle area, just about behind every business you'll notice that there's a container of one sort or another, parked in a shipping door at those businesses, and it's vital to the economic maritime businesses in the Seattle harbor that access to Terminal 46 is maintained and that a better program of realignment to the south at Pier 25 and what's now Pier 30 is addressed.

So, I would like to see the Port, the City, the State Department of Transportation, sit down, and included in that the B.N. Railroad, and work out a realignment of the whole viaduct situation there were it would join the new Downtown Seawall and Viaduct Project. Thank you.

83

Comment

Something definitely needs to be done about the Viaduct. Would like to see a tunnel with a park along the waterfront. Would definitely hate to see any TALL buildings that would detract from the waterfront area. Let's keep it as a park-like area instead of developers gobbling up the space for high-rise buildings, just to have a view or boast of being located on the sound.

84

Comment

I live on Phinney Ridge and routinely use the Viaduct. Presently, at most times, it works very well north or south bound. It is extremely important to me that whatever option is selected, that it is not one that reduces capacity, including at the north entry points to the Viaduct. Thus I would strongly oppose the Bypass and Surface alternatives. I love the views from the Viaduct, but would be willing to sacrifice them for the benefit of downtown for the Tunnel Alternative.

85

Comment

I am disappointed that the public hearing does not allow for oral public comments - the mention of a court reporter is misleading, implying that this would be the case.

As a resident of a property adjacent to the project, I am concerned about construction impacts and will detail those in a letter. As a citizen of this city I advocate the tunnel alternative as the most desirable. Once again, as an adjacent property owner I object to the location of the Pike Street vent building as it is shown directly adjacent to Hillclimb court and would like to see it relocated to the south, away from our residence, Ross Manor, and Pike Place Day Care. The data resulting from the modeling does not satisfy the concerns we have about the health risks, particularly for the children and the elderly, resulting from a concentrated stream of particulate matter and other pollutants. A way to move the building, even if it means additional vent buildings will be needed to satisfy the spacing requirements, must be considered/found. Thanks, we look forward to our continued participation in your process.

Comment

1425 Western Avenue
 Hillclimb Court
 Seattle, WA 98101
 May 28, 2004

Ms. Allison Ray
 Alaskan Way Viaduct and Seawall Replacement Project Office
 999 Third Avenue, Suite 2424
 Seattle, WA 98104

SR 99 – Alaskan Way Viaduct and Seawall Replacement Project
 Draft Environmental Impact Statement Comment

Hillclimb Court is located at 1425 Western Avenue and is directly adjacent to the Viaduct project site. Our condominium complex has 37 residential units and 3 retail units.

Our collective concerns for the Alaskan Way Viaduct project, regardless of the alternative chosen, are as follows:

1: Construction Impacts

- A. Establish a forum for residences and businesses adjacent to the project site to work with the design team to assure that the concerns about construction impacts are met.
- B. Noise: Limit construction noise that exceeds the City of Seattle residential nighttime noise regulations to non-residential areas of the project site. Appendix F states that City noise levels are expected to be exceeded in the nighttime and this is not acceptable in a residential area.
- C. Traffic: We are concerned about increased traffic on Western Avenue caused by any detours to SR 99. Southbound traffic should be diverted before reaching the Pike Place Market area, perhaps at Broad or Denny Way, thereby preventing additional congestion in the vicinity of Pike Place Market.
- D. Develop a clear process by which claims for any damage to adjacent properties can be made and fully compensated. Full disclosures of project insurance levels or self insurance of WSDOT should be made.
- E. Phase construction adjacent to Hillclimb Court to maintain parking garage exit access onto Alaskan Way. Integrate safe access into final design.
- F. Provide adequate dust control during demolition.

2: Community Impacts

Develop programs to keep area businesses alive during the project period. Having people continue to access the area shops and restaurants will enhance the safety of the adjacent neighborhoods. Consider mitigating impacts to neighborhood business with a public information campaign.

3: Design Alternative Impact

Locate Pike Street Ventilation Building and its stacks someplace other than the Pike Place Market Hillclimb residential area. The EIS needs to address the release of concentrated pollutants and their effect on a residential property directly adjacent to the proposed ventilation stack. What are the effects of constant exposure to the plume from the ventilation building? What type of particulate matter will be released and what are the health risks? Ross Manor and Heritage House are neighborhood homes for the elderly, and many children play in the Hillclimb Court courtyard and in Pike Place Market Daycare. They should not be exposed to concentrated airborne pollutant levels with the greater associated health risks that would result from the ventilation stacks. The EIS should also address the change in character of the ambient noise resulting from the frequency and steady sound of the fans. These concerns should affect a location for the building to a non-residential area. There are many options further south of the currently proposed location so it is not located next door to people's homes.

Thank you for your consideration of these matters.

87

Comment

I strongly favor the Tunnel Alternatives over any of the other Alternatives. This is an opportunity for major improvement in urban design of Seattle. The viaduct was an ill conceived engineering based solution to begin with. I think that the relatively small difference in cost (except for the outlandish surface solution) between this and other alternatives makes this the most sensible alternative. I worked in San Francisco when the Embarcadero Freeway cut into the heart of the city and have visited after it was torn down and was amazed at the vitality of the area and integration of the water edge into the city. This shows the tremendous potential economic payback that the Tunnel Alternative presents.

88

Comment

1. Great!
2. Pioneer Square will be significantly impacted by the loss of parking and reduction of circulation. Solution: Open up Occidental corridor for limited traffic, also consider permanent use of north lot for community parking. Develop housing above and retail around the parking structure. Project may finance itself. (North portion of North lot)

89

Comment

1. This is a region wide issues - essential arterial not just a Seattle issue.
2. Best choice new tunnel 4 or 5 lanes in each direction.
3. Next best Aerial new above grade built with open light and view passing through steel or not thick, grey, massive light blocking, view blocking concrete!

90

Comment

Please make sure this project works for the entire west side of Puget Sound and not just consider down town Seattle. Please plan for the FUTURE need of the area. Let's avoid the mistakes made with I-5, 520 & I-90 where they were inadequate to handle the increased traffic in just a few short years. Make a tunnel with 5 (FIVE)lanes in each direction stacked with two on/off ramps to downtown. Make some people friendly green park spaces with seating, as well as spaces for flower, coffee, hot dog, etc.

91

Comment

The viaduct must be torn down and not replaced. I support the concerns of the People's Waterfront Coalition. The tunnel is WAY TOO EXPENSIVE, DISRUPTIVE and there is probably a fair chance that it will be underwater in the next few decades when the automobiles that are driving in it cause the ocean levels to rise from global warming. We must reclaim the waterfront for the citizens of Seattle and our visitors, and stop making the automobile our number one priority and addiction. This is our only long term logical solution. Be brave, think ahead and help transform our waterfront into something amazing.

Comment

I use the Viaduct on a regular basis, but as an architect and visionary, I feel that it would be a great step in city development to remove the eye sore and noise of the viaduct from our water front. The viaduct is ugly, noisy, and physically and psychologically separates the downtown from the waterfront. The separation is an historical outcome of the days when the waterfront was an industrial zone, but with the current use of the waterfront as a tourist attraction (which could be better) and a Seattle public amenity, the industrial components need to be removed / concealed. For these reasons, I support the removal of the viaduct and support the tunnel solution. The tunnel would completely eliminate the structural and noise impact of traffic and since subsurface work is required in the area due to replacement of the seawall, it only makes sense to build both at the same time. The tunnel solution would also create developable land on the surface both for a smoother more pedestrian based circulation corridor as well as more retailing opportunities that our waterfront definitely needs to encourage tourist growth.

June 1, 2004

AWV Project Office
Allison Ray
999 Third Avenue, Suite 2424
Seattle, WA 98104

Dear Ms. Ray:

The dialog regarding the upcoming changes to the Seattle waterfront is encouraging. I applaud the City and all the partners for the effort that has gone into exploring options for a truly great central waterfront fitting for a city of Seattle's stature. This is a once in a century opportunity calling for a bold statement. Although funding is a challenge, lack of money is no excuse for doing the wrong thing. If there is political will there is a way. This opportunity for Seattle has come on our watch and we are the ones who will be to blame if we mess it up a second time. An attractive city where people want to live and work makes economic sense and is a good investment.

The cut and cover tunnel, although a disappointment to me since it doesn't go far enough in creating a destination pedestrian space at the water and getting traffic past Belltown, is the best alternative. No additional surface traffic should be placed on the Alaskan Way Corridor. Have you looked at all alternatives for reducing the traffic there? How much could actually be diverted to the freeway or other routes?

My excitement about the possibility of removing the Viaduct is diminished by the fact that it seems to be at the expense of Belltown. We do not want a raised viaduct into the Battery Street tunnel nor extra traffic on our streets especially Western and Elliott. The noise level at the Belltown P-Patch and Cottage Park is already so loud it interferes with programs in the park. Will the traffic pattern you project increase this noise level? If so, what mitigating measures do you propose?

The waterfront is Belltown's front yard. Getting to it is problematic right now. How much will the traffic on our north/south streets increase and what will you do to improve pedestrian safety when crossing these streets? Almost every street is a major pedestrian corridor to the waterfront connecting hundreds of people to their front yard and recreation area. It doesn't seem like the right thing to do to create more of a barrier to the waterfront than already exists. In fact, this project should improve the connection. Have you reviewed the Growing Vine Street Plan to see that the community has planned for a major pedestrian connection to the water at Vine Street? How will the proposed sea wall construction and traffic patterns impact or support this plan?

Getting the traffic into the Battery Street Tunnel is a design problem. We do not want an elevated structure that makes the situation worse than already exists. Did you notice that the Belltown Neighborhood Plan identifies the intersection of 1st and Battery as "view point"? Not only is there a view corridor to the water, but the amount of street area around and including the triangular piece of land which, I think, is owned by City light, amounts to nearly three acres. This amount of open space lets the sun into the heart of Belltown. Pedestrians should be able to flow pleasantly down to the waterfront from this location. What are the negative impacts of the tunnel entrance design on this view point and the pedestrian connection to the waterfront? How can they be mitigated?

Western Avenue will be the major pedestrian connection between the new Sculpture Park and the Pike Place Market. Hundreds of residential units front on this street and will use it daily. How will your plans for Western Avenue accommodate this increased pedestrian traffic considering both safety and the quality of the experience?

Remember, we will soon forget how much the project cost but we will live with the results for decades. Don't miss this once-in-a-lifetime opportunity by taking shortcuts that we will all regret for the rest of our lives.

Sincerely,

Carolyn Geise, FAIA

94

Comment

Most important that we keep the traffic which uses this corridor moving throughout the project - this is the lifeline of the west side of Seattle. Critical!

95

Comment

- To me I fail to see the need to bundle the widening of the Mercer Street overpass into this project. I consider it a S. Lake Union project not a viaduct/waterfront project.

- Access to Ballard, Magnolia, Interbay must be maintained regardless of the alternative.

96

Comment

I am glad to see WSDOT putting time and energy into dealing with the Alaskan Way Viaduct. I wish the people working on the RTID would realize that it and 520 have to be seen as our top two priorities, since we must maintain what we already have before we go building additional capacity! Having said that, I am frankly less than enthusiastic about most of the alternatives presented. I am a strong supporter of the Seattle Monorail Project, but I would still like to see a non-elevated roadway structure take the place of the current Viaduct, a position some might call contrary. However, the Monorail's shadow and view blockage envelopes are tiny compared to those of the current Viaduct [or the Rebuild/Aerial Alternatives]. Looking at the amount of time a mega-project like this would take to complete, in addition to the large chance of cost overruns [see the Big Dig in Boston, throw in Seattle's all-fill waterfront, etc.], I am left agreeing with the People's Waterfront Coalition that the best solution may be no solution at all. Let's take these 120,000 car trips a day and redirect them. Fully fund and integrate passenger-only ferry service. Expand the current waterfront streetcar line north into Magnolia and east to 23rd/Jackson. Increase express bus service. Put the rest of the cars onto our existing street grid. Indeed, while we're working on streetcars, let's bring back the old Madison Street line to provide another connector to First Hill and Capitol Hill. I realize these ideas don't deal with freight traffic...so why not make freight-only corridors on Alaskan Way, which is already the recommended freight through-route? I believe those freight trips are more important than SOV commuter trips anyway, since in the long run we are going to have to give up the SOV options, as gas prices continue to increase. Let's get ahead of the curve and start planning for the future.

Comment

The Duwamish Planning Committee
 55 South Atlantic Street, Suite 402
 Seattle, WA 98134

May 15, 2004

Ms. Allison Ray
 Alaskan Way Viaduct project
 999 Third Avenue, Suite 2424
 Seattle, WA 98104

SR-99 Viaduct and Seawall Replacement – Comments on Draft EIS

Dear Ms. Ray:

The Duwamish Planning Committee has been meeting with the Alaskan Way Viaduct Design Team for the past three years. We have evaluated the various proposals for reconstruction of the Viaduct and its arterials. It has become increasingly apparent that all of the alternatives currently under consideration have significant negative impacts on transportation and freight mobility within the Duwamish Manufacturing and Industrial Center. The severity of these impacts are highly dependent on the preferred alternative that emerges from the final EIS and the design details of the finalized report. The only viable alternative delineated in the Draft EIS is a variation of the cut and cover tunnel. Our major areas of concern have been expressed to the design team during our meetings and are delineated below.

- The planning and design process for the SR-99 Viaduct demonstrates the lack of coordinated regional transportation planning in the Seattle area. The preliminary designs for this project were developed without referencing the Duwamish Manufacturing and Industrial Plan, or integrating its transportation priorities. The design alternatives described in the Draft EIS fail to adequately address the interface of SR-99 with other major arterials and proposed transportation projects in the area. These include, but are not limited to, both phases of the SR-519 Project, the Spokane Street Viaduct Project, and the connection to Interstate 5 via SR-509.
- This Alaskan Way Viaduct a vital freight corridor servicing industrial and warehousing operations in Seattle's two designated manufacturing and Industrial Centers. The Duwamish and Ballard Interbay M and I Centers are home to more than 4500 businesses and 80,000 employees. The viability of these businesses depends on an efficient and functional transportation infrastructure. Boeing attempted to make this point for years before relocating its headquarters to Chicago. In a DPC survey of businesses that had moved out of the Duwamish, transportation congestion and impeded access were repeatedly cited as primary reasons. It is imperative that any Preferred Alternative preserve the existing capacity provided by SR-99. It is also important that the project designed to enhance and not impede access to local businesses.
- The SR-99 Surface Street alternative, as described in the Draft EIS, is unacceptable. It would significantly reduce the through capacity of the corridor and exacerbate our regional transportation problems. It would also generate increased congestion on Interstate 5 and all local arterials.
- The Bypass Tunnel, as described in the Draft EIS, is unacceptable because it would sever the vital connection between the two designated M and I center, the Duwamish and Ballard Interbay (BINMIC). This would force an excessive amount of truck and commercial traffic onto local streets and arterials, increasing delivery times and operational costs for industrial businesses.
- The elimination of access ramps in the area of the downtown office core will have a significant impact on the North Duwamish. Without these ramps and the access that they currently provide, increased commuter traffic will be channeled into the Duwamish M and I Center from Michigan Street, north. This will increase congestion on already crowded arterials, making access to local businesses more difficult and lengthening transit times for freight deliveries. The proposed design alternatives described in the Draft EIS seem to favor the Central Business District at the expense of industrial and manufacturing operations.
- The proposed addition of a Northbound off-ramp at our near Atlantic Street is another significant concern. After detailed review by our team of transportation consultants, this proposed ramp was removed from the approved project list in the Duwamish Manufacturing Industrial Center Plan. This ramp will dump an excessive amount of vehicular traffic into the surface street in an already congested area. Many of these vehicles will be seeking a direct link from Highway 99 to the I-5 and I-90 corridors. This ramp provides no significant benefits to industrial businesses or property owners, yet it will significantly impact freight mobility in the area.
- The impacts of this project on the properties and businesses located north of Holgate and west of First Avenue needs to be analyzed in detail. All of the proposed alternatives severely restrict access and egress to and from these businesses and make freight deliveries virtually impossible.
- Any design option for the Viaduct must adequately address its interface with both Phase One and Two of the SR-519 Project. Current proposals to redesign Phase Two of the SR-519 Project. Current proposals to redesign Phase Two of the SR-519 Project and eliminate the west bound offramp are unacceptable. The full couplet design for the SR-519 Project functioned efficiently because it distributed traffic evenly over a larger area, channeling access and distribution through a greater number of intersections. During our committee's work on the Duwamish M and I Center Plan, all of the analysis done by our transportation consultants showed that the full benefits of the SR-519 Project would not be realized until both phases were completed. Phase one alone has a greater negative impact on freight mobility and access to local businesses because it channels significant volumes of commuter traffic further south into the industrial zones, clogging arterials and degrading levels of service at key intersections. The intersection at First and Atlantic has become increasingly congested since the opening of Phase One of the SR-519 Project. The right-of-way on Atlantic Street is considerably narrower than that on Royal Brougham and can not be expected to handle the volumes of traffic that are being projected. Every traffic forecast that we have seen indicates that the service level of this intersection will continue to degrade as the area develops.

· The elimination of proposed improvements in the connections of the Viaduct to Spokane Street create additional impacts for Duwamish businesses, as well as freight mobility. The elimination of adequate Westbound access to the Spokane Street Viaduct will significantly increase congestion North of Spokane Street. The current

configuration of the Spokane Street Viaduct project will force truck and delivery vehicles to travel North to Lander Street, West on Lander, and then South on First Avenue to access the Westbound lanes of the Viaduct. This circuitous route will add significantly to the levels of traffic between Spokane and Lander Streets. The current design for the Spokane Street Viaduct is nine years old. It was developed before either of the sports stadiums were constructed and well before the SR-519 Project was designed. The design for Spokane Street is obsolete. It does not interface adequately with the Sr-519 Project or the Viaduct alternatives as described in the EIS

- Considering the potential commercial development in South Downtown, the section of the viaduct between Jackson and Holgate Streets is critical. Since Safeco Field and the Seahawks Stadium and Exhibition Center opened, traffic congestion in this area has increased significantly. As the economy improves and development increases within the Stadium Transition Zone, these traffic problems will be exacerbated. The new I-C Zone surrounding Safeco Field provides the capacity for 3 million square feet of office and commercial development. To date, the SDOT traffic models have failed to take these land use actions into account. It is imperative that viaduct planners take future development in this area into consideration. This may require modifying the City traffic analysis software to evaluate the impact of significantly increase density on transportation in this area.
- The design of this project in the vicinity of SAFECO Field and Seahawks Stadium needs to be reexamined. The Port of Seattle is committed to the long term use of Terminal 46 as a container facility for Hanjin. This requires access to the north SIG yard as well as to I-5 and I-90 via SR-519. The design alternatives currently under consideration do not address the long term requirements of the Port, nor do they provide adequate access to business and properties in the vicinity of the project. The ideal solution to the complex issues in this area would seem to be an extension of the cut and cover tunnel south to Holgate Street. This option was investigated earlier in the design phase, but was rejected as too costly. We believe that the extension of a tunnel through this area has merit and should be reexamined. It solves the east west access issues and provides a much broader range of options for future development in the area. We need only look at Boston for a catalogue of innovative transportation solutions. The Ted Williams Tunnel, the Charles River Bridge, tunnel jacking, advance soil stabilization techniques and collaboration with Japanese and European engineering firms are setting standards for the next century. While Boston is developing a world-class transportation infrastructure, Seattle is mired in cost conscious political expediency. Effective long term solutions may be more expensive initially, but short-term fixes will cost considerably more over the long term.
- Budgeting for the mitigation of Viaduct construction impacts must adequately account for the length of construction and the severity of these impacts on local businesses. The City must develop a comprehensive plan to address the alternative routing of freight and oversized vehicles during the construction period.

Any replacement for the viaduct must maintain or expand existing capacity and access, anything less will create additional transportation problems which will have to be faced in the future. It must also address the reconstruction of the crumbling sea wall which supports the viaduct itself. The only current alternative that addresses all of these issues is the cut and cover tunnel. It opens up Seattle's waterfront, simultaneously replaces the seawall and – most importantly – preserves capacity. The City and State have been exploring every option to reduce costs of this project. We are concerned that these agencies are in such a rush to fund and initiate construction that they are willing to settle for an inadequate alternative which creates more problems than it solves.

David Hutchhausen – Chair
Duwamish Planning Committee

98

Comment

Please use this opportunity to capitalize on this major project to accomplish more than a multi-billion dollar rebuild of the cracking viaduct and aging seawall. A group of us are sending a letter asking for more regional cooperation to revitalize the waterfront, increase opportunities for people and goods to move through SEattle in a systemic way, and improve our economy and environment simultaneously. We need a regional czar to oversee and implement the project on the waterfront. By pass tunnel should be covered at least to Battery Street.

99

Comment

I am in strong support for the full tunnel option. We have a once in a century opportunity to reconnect downtown with the waterfront. Surface and elevated options will only doom our ability to ever become a world-class waterfront city. We will be a Long Beach instead of a Vancouver.

100

Comment

I want to see us keep the viaduct as either the REBUILD or the AERIAL with the objective of protecting the views thousands of us have come to value. The views are integral to the enjoyment of living in this great city. I drive out of town guests along the viaduct to show them how the city is laid out and the views of the Olympics Sound and downtown going north and the Sound waterfront and Duwamish port activities going south. It is a great introduction. It is unique in the world. Seattle has not been good about protecting its views. The viaduct allows people at ground level to look under it and people in tall buildings to look over it. Primarily, though, I'm interested in protecting the views for all of us who drive it. I also want to suggest that you not add any more on or off ramps to the new structure than positively necessary because that would slow traffic down, and as it is now we can travel very smoothly on the viaduct. It has been an excellent means for commuting. I ! would like it to stay a viaduct above ground and rebuilt in sections that would disrupt traffic the least.

101

Comment

The tunnel alternative would be the best choice to reduce air pollution downtown, reduce noise pollution for business people and residents downtown, and to open up the shoreline area for human enjoyment and habitat restoration for fish and other wildlife. What a wonderful opportunity to incorporate the natural world into our daily lives even in an urban environment. We are often credited with being far-thinking. Let's demonstrate that it can actually be true!

102

Comment

Appears to be very thorough review of alternatives. Graphics are very helpful.

My preference is for the Tunnel Alternative. Let's connect downtown to the waterfront. I am concerned with lost parking, but I'm sure that can be resolved. I find it a little odd that there's not more green park area in this scheme - perhaps similar to the thin park trails @ Myrtle Edwards. It would be great if this could all connect. Seems we've added a few more lanes of surface traffic - why can't service vehicles turn off the regular road?

103

Comment

The tunnel is by far the best alternative. The chance to open up the waterfront to the city is a chance that will not come again. The traffic and construction impacts seem fairly normal for a project of this scope. The issues seem to be:

1. The loss of parking along the waterfront. The will impact well into the downtown area with tourists and waterfront workers not having accessible parking.
2. Connection to the Coleman ferry dock. Has the future (proposed) expansion been taken into account? The access to the dock could really tie up traffic trying to get into downtown.
3. Terminal 46(?) (Hanjin Shipping) With rumors circling with the Port and developers, the has the potential to be developed by the time this project could begin construction. Will future access / loads be explored for this kind of contingency?

104

Comment

We have a unique opportunity to create something beautiful and healthy for our waterfront. I am reminded of the Olmstead parks and blvds legacy. Building the larger tunnel for traffic will leave more open space for us to create something beautiful. We must push for the most beautiful, enhanced, retrofitted ecological, Northwest style possible because it will be paredback.

I am excited that we have this unique opportunity to build and create a new seawall that will enhance and promote healthy sealife. There is nothing more beautiful and aesthetic as healthy life.

105

Comment

1. The tunnel, as proposed, is the worst alternative. The increased danger from fire or explosion gives the tunnel option similar possibilities for catastrophic loss of life as the existing structure. Also, this tunnel will be unique because there would be more pressure on one side than the other in the event of seawall failure. The tunnel is below the water table and below the surface of the sound. Lifetime operations costs will also be greater than any other option. Alternate routing of flammable materials that use neither I-5 or the new tunnel will be required in the event both fire systems are down.

2) I see no mention of multimodal considerations. The city faces multiple big ticket items in the near future including the rebuilding of the downtown train tunnel. Could this vital corridor be used to create 2 tracks to keep vital rail service moving? Also, all alternatives do not solve a long standing problem of lack of parking and ferry line access. And what about public transit, other than the cool, but lame, trolley, bus service is poor in the area. While developing the corridor could provision be made for mass transit, perhaps a monorail corridor that serves most of Seattle's waterfront attractions and maybe more latter?

3) An old boss of mine pointed out that every challenge identified was supposed to have a solution....This alternative should be considered. The urban revionsists that want a vital transportation corridor converted into a big park missed the point, the best view is not from the street level, but from the top level of the viaduct. Build a two level structure wider than the existing viaduct, but put the traffic on the surface and middle areas. The top level would be a pedestrian area level with 1st avenue and could accommodate limited surface roads. Public private partnerships could be use to build a limited number of low height buildings for things like a good restaurant. Leave enough room on the waterfront side to have a three lane + bikes surface road. Terraced and ramped structures at 3 to 5 points would provide ADA and pedestrian access to the waterfront. The structure needs to go out to a single level in the vicinity of the ferry docks. Some mitigation, or lowering the roadway might be needed in the Pioneer square area where the hill disappears. The traffic levels would be open on the waterfront side to reduce lighting and ventilation costs (exhaust fans might be entirely eliminated). It may be possible to incorporate two tracks for rail on the downtown side of the structure, both solving the need for the existing tunnel and increasing rail (and commuter rail) capacity. It may be possible to eliminate all at grade crossings from Broad St. south. Monorail, I'd leave the politicians, but keeping the possibility of adding in later would be a plus.

106

Comment

REBUILD alternative is not acceptable. We must take this opportunity to improve as many aspects of traffic flow and environmental impact as we can.

SURFACE alternative is not acceptable. Unacceptable impacts to noise, traffic volume, travel times, the separation of downtown from the waterfront caused by a broad "river of cars", and the pedestrian experience of the waterfront.

AERIAL alternative is only marginally acceptable. Unfortunately it still retains the "wall" that separates downtown from its precious resource, the waterfront. Seattle has historically been highly connected to its water, and the wall that separates our downtown from that resource should come down. This alternative also contributes to high noise levels, and the wall will remain a visual blight.

BYPASS tunnel is somewhat acceptable. It has significant and undesirable impacts on travel times southbound from Ballard and northbound from S. Spokane St.

TUNNEL is the most desirable alternative: lowest noise, best travel times, best impacts on waterfront experience, best impacts on overall travel times and capacities, best visual impacts. It is the most expensive but the cost would be worth it.

107

Comment

(Through the Spanish Interpreter.)

Good afternoon. My name is William Ramiraz. I come one behalf of Casa Latina. I have one comment, and some concerns. For my comment I have two points that I'd like to make. Okay. So they've told us that they have a project with Viaduct, that they want to move, because of the Viaduct they want to move us to a different location. Okay. So I would just like to mention that the place where the CASA Latina is located, and where the workers congregate, is a place where we are together from early in the morning until late in the evening.

For us, CASA Latina is the area that we congregate, is very important, and it's very important for the Latino community in Seattle, Washington. So, the reason that it is so important for us is that we are working every day from this place to be able to support our families. I would like to ask, then, the City of Seattle and the administrative personnel of the City, that they consider this point: I would just like to ask that you consider very seriously where we will go if we are moved and, as Hispanics in this country, what will happen to us as part of this project.

So, my first point is that, as Hispanics and as members of CASA Latina, so that they, in the projects, that will be as construction and other projects, as part of the overall viaduct project, that they give us priority and that they provide some sort of jobs for us to be part of the overall project. And so, it would be acceptable, any kind of position that we could have with the project, because CASA Latina has qualified workers. They've been trained to do various different types of jobs.

The second point, and I'll conclude after this, we understand and we respect why the City is going to move us from this place. I'd like to mention again, knowing that the City is going to move us, and that they are going to help us to find a new location, we ask that it be in a place that is very easy for people to get to, and very easy for the people who need workers to come to and pick up the different workers. We need easy access. So, we know that the City could put us in a very spacious place anywhere, that they could find some extra space, but it's very important for us to be in a place that's close to the center, and that it's easy for the people who need workers to come and pick people up.

Okay. And that's it. Thank you very much.

108

Comment

I would like to state my concern about the displacement of CASA Latina day laborers in the Belltown area and strongly urge this project to consider their longtime "home" and how to relocate this center near the free ride zone as well as near freeway access which is critical to the economic survival of this community. Additionally - please establish a system that supports prioritizing those contractors willing to utilize the labor of these same soon to be displaced workers. Thank you.

109

Comment

The project will displace the CASA Latina Day Workers Center, which provides important employment and leadership opportunities to Latino immigrants. We ask that the City provide its support as we seek to relocate to a new site near the free metro bus zone and with good freeway access. We also ask that the City contract only with companies that agree to work with CASA Latina workers. Thank you.

110

Comment

Please assist Casa Latina in relocation of Day Workers' Center. This support should be both financial and political. Please also give priority to contractors who agree to hire Casa Latina Workers.

111

Comment

Since this project will be displacing the current "CASA Latina" Day Workers Center I would like to see help provided to find a new location for CASA. Also, I would like to see the construction company involved in this project to give preference to CASA Workers.

112

Comment

Casa Latina's work dispatch center will be displaced by this project resulting in a loss of many jobs. I think contractors on the project should be granted preference if they hire Casa Latina workers. Assistance for relocation of the dispatch center to within walking distance of the free ride zone should also be required.

113

Comment

I work closely with the participants of Casa Latina. Their Day Labor Center will be dislocated once this project gets started. In order to have the least impact on the lives of these working poor men and women we ask two things:

- 1) The city should provide assistance/ financial as well as political to reestablish the day workers center in the downtown area, near the freeway or in the SODO area. This will provide continuity in employment and the economy of our city.
- 2) Ensure the contractor hired for this major project has a commitment to working with and hiring Latino day laborers.

114

Comment

April 27, 2004

According to the environmental impact statement, the people who live near the viaduct are disproportionately poor and Latino. They will be the ones most impacted by the reconstruction and they are the ones who historically have had the weakest voice. Thank you very much for the outreach that the DOT and Sea Trans has done so far to take into account the impact on this community.

Because of this outreach, we are here to represent the over 1000 Latino day laborers who look for work on an annual basis through CASA Latina who will be adversely impacted by the viaduct reconstruction process. In all of the five alternatives, the CASA Latina Day Workers' Center will be displaced and the livelihood of these 1000 day laborers will be affected.

The Casa Latina day laborers understand that they need to move for the good of the community. They ask that their displacement be mitigated in the following two ways.

- 1) That the DOT give priority to construction companies that include in their bids a commitment to working with CASA Latina to employ our workers in the construction.
- 2) That the City of Seattle work with DOT to relocate the CASA Latina Day Workers' Center to a suitable location. The workers and the board of CASA Latina have determined that near Home Depot in the SoDo neighborhood would be an ideal relocation site but we need both political and economic assistance to be able to move there. We are asking that you give us this support.

Hilary Stern
Executive Director.

115

Comment

(Through the Spanish Interpreter)

My name is Luis Flores, and I come on behalf of Casa Latina, okay, but I also have my own opinion.

They told us that they were going to move CASA Latina from where it is now, so I think, and also my colleagues at CASA Latina think, that this is going to greatly affect us. So, I come representing several other colleagues as well, and we want to ask the City that they help us find another place that we can find work. So, we would very much like it to be somewhere close to the downtown, because most of us don't have any transportation and we can't go to places that are far away on our own. So, this way we will be able to continue work and go help our families.

So, there's at least 1,000 to 1,500 new workers that come very year to CASA Latina to work with CASA Latina. So, we need this place very much, but also the people who will come in the future need this place. So, the workers at CASA Latina are helping the City of Seattle, and helping to make it a prettier and nicer city. Okay. So we are helping homeowners improve their homes, and help to save them money by them using our labor.

And to the authorities and administrators that are managing this project, one more time, please help us. And we have faith in the authorities that they will help us.

116

Comment

(Through the Spanish Interpreter.)

So, I agree that and I support that they have a new place for CASA Latina. And this is for our families, and so that we can support our families. And I would prefer that, if possible, that it be that the jobs that they find are more stable, longer lasting positions, rather than just a few days. Maybe more like six months is better for the CASA Latina workers, because the Casa Latina workers are very good workers, and they're good workers, they've come here to help the City of Seattle, and hope the opposite happens as well, that the Seattle citizens help the CASA Latina workers as well.

Another point, so, I would like that the support that CASA Latina will get to be more formal and happen sooner rather than later. So, I don't have much else to say, but just that hopefully we can help and that everybody will do their part in order to make this happen.

I would also just like work. We'll all be more secure, if we have jobs that last longer than just today. And because people are always going to be coming back, day after day after day, as it is now. Okay.

117

Comment

Casa Latina understands that it has to move for the benefit of the community. However, Casa Latina requests two mitigating alternatives to its displacement. First, we ask that the DOT give priority to construction companies that employ workers signed with Casa Latina. Secondly, we ask that DOT and the City of Seattle help Casa Latina find a suitable location to move to. Such assistance includes political and economical assistance. Casa Latina prefers to relocate near Home Depot in the SODO area.

118

Comment

As a board member of CASA Latina since 1997 and a Seattle resident, my main concerns are with the impact that this project will have on the Day Worker Center in the Belltown neighborhood run by CASA Latina. I would like to see two things: (1) Assistance in relocating the Day Worker Center to a site in the free bus zone or the Sodo neighborhood. Day workers have been coming to the area where the Day Worker Center is for decades, and considerations for them and their employers should be taken into account. Given that many workers are low income and often live in the downtown shelters, a new site in the free bus zone is ideal. (2) Serious consideration of the laborers in the Day Worker Center for projects and contracts associated with the building of the new Viaduct project.

119

Comment

Hi,

I know that jurisdiction over signage for SR-99 within the City of Seattle falls mostly to the City but I wanted to point out some problems with the current system which I hope will be addressed in the replacement. Some of these comments might fall outside of the scope of your EIS but as transportation mobility issues I think they deserve airing.

Access to ferries

From the north of the Pike Market, prior to the entrance to SR-99 signage indicates on City streets that one should use the viaduct for access to the ferry terminal. This however is neither necessarily a good idea, nor is it supported by the City in other uses of these roadway connections. In addition to the fact that the signs on 99 are unclear as to when one should exit, First Avenue South is not managed well during events at the Safeco Field and this causes much difficulty to one trying to get to the ferry terminal. The City of Seattle police block off most southbound lanes of First Avenue which creates a chokehold on the interchange, through traffic and to the ferry terminal --- all I suppose as a measure of crowd control. I don't know why they think that it makes sense to reduce roadway capacity when demand is highest but this is the current practice. I would like to see that the viaduct replacement adequately addresses and provide direction to the ferry terminals and the waterfront.

Usability and Signage

Signage on the current viaduct is also so abbreviated that if you are unsure of your exit to Downtown Seattle you are quickly shunted off to the ends of Downtown Seattle and have to travel via surface streets. I know that several of the proposed alternatives anticipate changing access to Downtown Seattle to outside the city center and utilizing surface streets more. It is imperative that the signage both on the SR-99 replacement and on the intended routes on the surface streets be logically and clearly marked so that visitors to our City are comfortable navigating about.

Access to Interbay/Magnolia

This is an important transportation for several of Seattle's neighborhoods and providing access to the west side of Queen Anne Hill, Interbay, Magnolia and Ballard needs to be clearly articulated via appropriate interchanges. Any expectation that this can be dealt with from Denny Way isn't realistic, not unless some serious traffic flow reworking is done and this would greatly reduce mobility on Denny Way, an already congested arterial.

Preferred Alternative

I prefer an all tunnel alternative as it would help open up that area of Seattle to development and help set our City apart in the World. This would likely result in the generation of more tax revenue for the State and could really help anchor the region's waterfront. The by-pass option doesn't improve the pedestrian or commercial environment unless you slowed traffic to a crawl on Alaska Way. I vote for a tunnel.

Thanks,
Ann

120

Comment

I prefer the aerial, but do not want the Broad St. overpass on even a temporary basis.

My second choice is the surface alternative.

121

Comment

1. The Battery Street detour option is very neighborhood intrusive and should be avoided.
2. Traffic on Elliott and Western are too heavy now. Options should be considered to reduce that.
3. The aerial structure from Stewart to Battery Street is neighborhood intrusive - as an alternate consider a tunnel lid.

All alternatives have an aerial section through Belltown from Stewart to the existing tunnel. This will be very noisy and visually ugly. Alternative must be considered to relieve noise and visual impacts.

122

Comment

- Maintain capacity of existing structure (I like the Tunnel but I also like the view from the viaduct).
- The 519 2nd phase should be built
- Highway 99 should be connected to I-5 without going on the surface. This was originally planned and would make driving to I-5 much more convenient.

123

Comment

I believe the seawall replacement and tunnel under Alaskan Way is by far the most desirable alternative. First it is the best aesthetically IF the land above the tunnel and that below the existing viaduct is converted to open space for the public with good access and parking from the new roadway. Second there appears to be an advantage for simultaneous use of the viaduct during a large part of the construction. The negatives of higher cost and loss of the view (mostly single drivers which should be eyes on the road) are greatly outweighed by the potentially magnificent public space. I support only minimal (5%) use of the land for income production to offset costs. Not billboards or similar advertising.

124

Comment

- 1) EIS provides insufficient information about traffic impacts in Belltown during construction periods for each alternative. It provides insufficient information about construction traffic routing and volumes for each alternative (dump trucks, concrete, rebar, etc.)
- 2) What is the evaluation, public comment/participation and approval process from this point including schedule?

125

Comment

I think that a "no replacement" alternative needs to be studied. I realize this goes against so many years of traffic engineering but I think we can at least look at it as an option. We know traffic will not go away but maybe the enormous amounts of money would be better spent improving I-5 and Alaskan Way surface street and downtown signaling, than replacing the structure or tunneling. Thank you.

126

Comment

The EIS's range of alternatives is presently incomplete. It needs to present and analyze what is almost certainly the simplest, most cost-effective, and least disruptive solution -- prioritizing human and urban values over the demands of vehicles by re-thinking and refining the larger transportation network instead of building a staggeringly expensive new aerial, surface or underground high-speed, high-capacity highway.

127

Comment

It appears to me that the tunnel alternative will make the most positive contribution to our city - for our economy and for our visitors. It appears well worth the significant investment - an investment critically important to the future of Seattle and the Puget Sound region.

128

Comment

West Seattle has commented for many years on this project to improve the northbound 99 onramp from the West Seattle Bridge to the viaduct. This must be included in this project. The capacity of this ramp and the viaduct needs to be increased. The Aerial alternative is best.

The Aerial Alternative should be selected. It best improves safety capacity and moving traffic. Please improve the northbound onramp from the West Seattle Bridge.

129

Comment

Before I came today I thought I was in favor the tunnel, After reviewing all of the proposals I am convinced that I prefer the tunnel. It is by far the most forward looking and will enhance the area as well as traffic flow. The higher price is cost effective.

130

Comment

March 31, 2004

Greg Nickels
PO Box 94749
Seattle, WA 98124-4749

Dear Greg Nickels,

I, a student at Bishop Blanchet High School, have two issues I want to talk to you about. I am writing a paper on the future project of re-building or fixing the Alaskan Way Viaduct. Choosing the project that best fits Seattle's needs is the question I am asking you.

Seattle, mostly on the liberal side, is dreaming for any kind of tunnel so that the waterfront has potential to become a very welcoming, park filled entrance to the city. I am in favor of what these people are towards for Seattle's upcoming, major project. The Viaduct has been a massive concrete wall separating the city from the waterfront for over fifty years and I think it has to go. I have lived in Seattle for my entire life and rarely go to the waterfront, because the Viaduct inconveniently blocks it. Though the tunnel option comes out to the highest price, I think we have the most potential as one of America's main port cities to have a new, populated waterfront. Imagining Seattle without the Viaduct just blows me away because such a dream would generate a much more lively waterfront in which all Seattle lights would want to visit. Mayor, Greg Nickels, what is your opinion on this upcoming project? I have researched and found information of you asking for federal funding for this project. What do you plan to do with this money? I am eager to hear your response because if this new Alaskan Way Viaduct becomes a tunnel without a massive cement structure, me and many other residents of Seattle would be grateful.

The second issue is on the future of Seattle's downtown. After reading Gordon Price's quote taken on November 25, 2003, I wondered on what the upcoming Seattle downtown would look like. I have always been interested in all sorts of architecture, city skyscraper building and running the city as the mayor in certain video game simulators. For the past couple of years these have been my main hobbies in which all of my other interests somewhat revolve around. In this section of Price's quote, "there's a sense in Seattle that maybe things are finally coming together for the Emerald City," what does he mean by this. Since it was on your homepage, it seems like you would know the answer to my question. What am I, a Seattle Light going to expect for the future of Seattle's downtown? What about a "denser downtown, with a web of transportation services." Can I expect to see Seattle without its horrible traffic problems in the near future, or is this a far from present dream of yours or Price's? When I think of the future of Seattle, I hope to see many of its traffic problems fixed to some extent, but from the recent past and present problems in its transportation system, I don't know how believable this dream is. I hope you can send me some plans for what Seattle is planning to do to come together as a linked city. I want to believe Seattle is seeing a bright future, I just don't see any straight facts on what is planning to happen. Thanks for your time.

Sincerely,

Mark D. Moynihan

131

Comment

Leave it as is and do retrofitting like what has been done on the Aurora Bridge and the freeway bridge over the canal. We can't afford to lose a major arterial through the city, transportation-wise and money-wise. We should be concentrating on the other transportation plans before we mess with another one! That's the problem with this city - way too many cooks in the kitchen! Too many ideas and nothing gets done.

132

Comment

When the Alaskan Way Viaduct (AWV) was built over five decades ago, the Waterfront and adjacent streets were filled with rundown piers and old buildings. In the 1960s, most of the old structures were torn down and turned into parking lots for the Seattle Worlds Fair. Starting in the late 1990s, condominium and apartment buildings were built, a new cruise ship terminal was built and the Waterfront will soon host the Seattle Art Museum Sculpture Park. Tourism and community activity along the Waterfront are now the driving factors in the area of the viaduct.

The effect of 110,000 vehicles on the homeowners in the immediate area is devastating. Noise, air, and water pollution are affecting us all and the concentration of people and vehicles is a poor mix. If the viaduct is so to be used as an alternative to I-5, then it must be put underground, insulated from the 50,000 people living along its length. We all know the seawall and viaduct have reached the end of their useful lifespan. The seawall does need to be repaired but the end of the viaduct is near and some other alternative must be considered.

Ultimately, the three leading agencies must answer to the 500,000 people who live within a mile or two of the viaduct. The decision to rebuild the viaduct, route traffic through our neighborhoods, and clog US-99, must not be made without our blessing. If we say, build it "Underground or Out of Town", then that is what we mean.

James R. Smith

The Alexandria Condominiums

133

Comment

Considering all the possibilities, the Tunnel Alternative represents a once-a-generation opportunity to remake the look and feel of downtown Seattle _as well as_ provide for the needs of drivers and commerce. Let's have vision, and not make the same mistake that King County voters made in turning down the Forward Thrust rail system bonds 30-some years ago - a decision for which we're still paying.

134

Comment

It is critical to the future of Seattle to bury 99 and have useable community green space. It should allow for commercial and residential development as necessary to build the downtown community as a place that is alive past 5pm.

135

Comment

I support the Rebuild Alternative over the other alternatives, for the following reasons:

(1) Maintaining the viaduct's traffic capacity with as little interruption as possible is crucial for West Seattle residents. When it is shut down for even short periods of time, traffic to and from West Seattle becomes gridlocked and unbearable. If it were torn down (or rendered unusable by an earthquake) before a fully-operational replacement were finished, it would wreak havoc on all West Seattle residents (and those who, e.g., work in West Seattle and reside elsewhere) for literally years. Businesses would suffer; property values would suffer; commuters would suffer. The entire city would suffer as a consequence. Shipping traffic would also be severely impacted, since many container ships dock on the west side of the Duwamish.

(2) The viaduct is one of the most -- if not the most -- scenic routes in the city. It is a mainstay for residents who want to show our city to visitors. It has been used repeatedly in commercials and movies due to its scenic features. It gives people a great overall view of both the waterfront and the skyscrapers. It is a landmark feature of our cityscape. I always enjoy driving on it because of the views it affords. I disagree strongly with those who call it an eyesore, or want to develop the land underneath it. The land underneath it functions as valuable (scarce), affordable parking for waterfront and downtown uses.

(3) The Rebuild Alternative would create the fewest construction impacts and require the least mitigation.

(4) The Rebuild Alternative would end up costing far less than any of the other alternatives, which is a very important factor to consider in this age of declining availability of funds for such projects.

(5) Rebuilding the viaduct could start (and be completed) far sooner than the other alternatives could be, which is a big plus.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment. Please choose the Rebuild Alternative.

136

Comment

I think we should take the lead from Portland and San Francisco. Tear down the Viaduct and do nothing! Other than making a park under where it now stands.

By the time the viaduct project is ready to go, driving a single occupant car will be less of an option for people. Why spend billions of dollars to promote global warming. I-5 is just fine thank you.

137

Comment

Can't the viaduct be seismically retrofitted without taking it down for substantially less cost? I've heard \$800 million. I'm not clear, is the seawall actually supporting the foundation of the viaduct and does it have to be rebuilt in order for any elevated to bridge to function safely? Why isn't the seawall a City project with a separate budget as opposed to a transportation department project? Is the city kicking in for that part of the project? Seems to me we are on a beer budget these days and are planning as though the champagne was still flowing. Any concept that doesn't allow at least as many car trips per day as currently use the viaduct is insane! Opening up the waterfront is the least of our urban priorities in this new age of austerity. I'd like all the wiring to be underground in my neighborhood, but it isn't fiscally possible or responsible.

138

Comment

This is a once-in-a-lifetime chance to reclaim precious waterfront territory and views. Seems the opportunity to improve the waterfront should help pay for these more costly options. A tunnel is the way to go.

139

Comment

I want to register my support for the Tunnel option. Seattle would become a world class city with this alternative. Opening downtown to the waterfront would add tremendous value to the downtown area and would increase investment in the waterfront area and would remove an eyesore from downtown. Additionally I would support making the tunnel a toll road to help pay for it.

140

Comment

I support the design that provides the best opportunity for future growth for downtown Seattle and a open waterfront.

I believe the tunnel design is the best option because it accomplishes both of these goals.

Although I am a supporter of historical landmarks, the Hwy 99 route is a physical barrier and fragments the city to sea relationship.

Vehicles drive much too fast on it to appreciate the view, cause excessive noise and pollution that contributes to the detriment of the waterfront. This provides all negative implications of any of the design solutions that resemble its stature on its replacement.

In my opinion, the best solution is one that makes it go away from anyone's 5 senses, sight, sound, smell, touch, taste.

The best solution is a tunnel design.

141

Comment

Securing a decision that meets the practical and affordable is always paramount in decisions like this. However, due to the massive opportunity to finally open up the waterfront to the downtown core I believe we should invest the additional money for the tunnel option. Perhaps an electronic toll system would best be employed for this particular project as it would enable users to pay for the new tunnel over the long term. This is definitely a tough decision to make but I feel that the opportunity we have to shape the entrance of our entire waterfront is too great to try to rebuild a structure that most people, if money was not an option, would rather tear down and put underground.

142

Comment

Most importantly to me is that the Sea Wall be deep enough so that SR99 can be built next to across for puget sound while making building sites available above. For example in Boston, MA from the Airport pas the city one travel under a series of different hotels and corporations along with roads between them. Of course I would like to see green spaces city owned parking stalls for water front enthusiast's. That have meters for 5 hours of parking. This is an opportunity that we have to make an impact so that the environment and that our historical Seattle is not disrupted or torn down.

143

Comment

Mr. John K. Naden
3818 43rd Ave NE
Seattle, WA 98105

March 31, 2004

Mayor Greg Nickols
Mayor's Office
Seattle City Hall
Seattle, WA 98105

Dear Mayor Nickels:

I am an 18 year old at Bishop Blanchet High School here in Seattle. I am writing to you to express my appreciation for your support of two different issues that are important to me. First of all, I think that the cleaning up of the University Ave. is very important, and I also think that your push for federal funding to fix the Alaskan Way viaduct is very important.

I live very close to the University Ave and have spent a lot of time there when growing up and it hasn't been in great shape lately. Along with fixing it up though I think that it's important to try and keep the culture. This means not making the building too nice so stores like "The Woolly Mammoth" and "Red Light Vintage Clothing" cannot afford to stay there anymore. Still, I can already see some changes, like re-paving of the roads, which is making a huge difference.

The Alaskan Way Viaduct is the best place to be stuck in traffic on the entire earth. The view of Puget Sound makes you forget your road rage. After the Nisqually earthquake in 2001 the viaduct and the Alaskan Way Seawall were both damaged and might not hold up in case of another large earthquake, it could not only be dangerous. Also, our traffic is pretty bad as it is, and if the viaduct had to close at times it would be hard to get anywhere.

I really appreciate what you are doing for the city. I can see that you truly care about making Seattle a better place for all that live here.

Sincerely yours,

John K. Naden

144

Comment

What issues concern you the most about the Rebuild alternative?

It concerns me that this project may extend beyond the projected timeline and that it may cause traffic problems for a long time, especially for people who use it for commuting purposes. I like this option or the Aerial best. It's amazing to drive in (or out) of Seattle on this road. I always take visitors this way to show off the city and the waterfront. It's also nice to have the parking available under the viaduct.

What issues concern you the most about the Aerial alternative?

I like the Aerial alternative best. It sounds the safest. I don't think widening the lanes will be helpful since it will still narrow to 3 lanes (when heading North bound) and will still cause traffic to slow. It's also nice to have the parking available under the viaduct.

What issues concern you the most about the Tunnel alternative?

The tunnel alternatives are my least favorite. You would not have the view anymore and I'm concerned that in a strong earthquake people may become trapped and/or drown if the seawall leaks. At least above ground people have a better chance of surviving.

What issues concern you the most about the Bypass Tunnel alternative?

The tunnel alternatives are my least favorite. You would not have the view anymore and I'm concerned that in a strong earthquake people may become trapped and/or drown if the seawall leaks. At least above ground people have a better chance of surviving.

What issues concern you the most about the Surface alternative?

The surface alternative would be my 3rd choice. It doesn't seem like it would make the waterfront more accessible since streets currently run UNDER the viaduct. Does this mean traffic on I-99 would have to stop at lights? Doesn't seem like this will help traffic flow at all as it would be like taking a surface street through downtown. This alternative is ultimately the safest in regards to earthquake safety. I don't support any "open" land being used for commercial use if more room becomes available.

What opportunities about these alternatives most interest you?

I think the time, money and safety are all important. As noted earlier, I'd prefer the Aerial alternative. People have enjoyed the view for years and it's part of Seattle. At least if you can't own a condo or work on the waterfront, you can enjoy this spectacular view while driving (also a bonus when stuck in bad traffic).

Other Comments

In light of 9/11, it seems appropriate to do any extra safety measures to protect such a vulnerable area (especially tunnels and bridges). I hope the city will consider this when building.

145

Comment

Obviously the tunnel is the best solution, but if that proves too expensive or difficult, please consider the surface alternative. It is the cheapest, easiest, and it would still open up the waterfront and get rid of that elevated freeway marring our beautiful city. I can't conceive of actually rebuilding the viaduct -- as if it were a good thing that we want to keep! Please -- our neighbors in Portland and Vancouver have embarrassed us long enough by their superior urban planning. Let's show that Seattle is also a progressive, forward-thinking city that puts livability and the needs of pedestrians over those of automobiles.

146

Comment

I strongly believe in the tunnel alternative. Even though it is the most expensive, it would tie together the waterfront with downtown and create a more tourist friendly area which would help the economy in the long run and therefore make the money well spent. It seems logical that if you have to dig to replace the seawall you have already created one side of the tunnel.

147

Comment

The tunnel is the best plan, the most costly but it will open up Seattle's waterfront.

148

Comment

I still believe that the tunnel alternative is the best option. It is a shame that we can't do something with the Battery Street Tunnel. It tends to be a bottleneck in the evenings.

149

Comment

Replace the Viaduct with a Tunnel.

The Viaduct effectively acts as a moat for the water front. While there is pedestrian traffic under the Viaduct, it would be greatly enhanced if the works were under ground. Other improvements would be view, noise, commerce. Better destination for cruise ships.

Engineers have tunnel under the English Channel. Lessons should have been learned from Boston's big dig.

Hope that Kerry wins in the fall. He'll be far more likely to give McDermot money than Bush.

150

Comment

It is imperative that the waterfront be returned to the people of Seattle and the region. That is why the best solution for the replacement of the Alaskan Way Viaduct is some sort of tunnel. I believe the option with the six lane tunnel is the best one.

151

Comment

I believe that a tunnel is the only option that can allow for a dynamic and scenic waterfront. The viaduct is a blight and a nuisance, built in an era when Seattleites were so in love with the automobile that they thought nothing of scarring the natural beauty of this site. We need to have a vision for the future that recognizes the extraordinary potential of this area. If our waterfront were properly developed to include parks, gardens, paths, galleries and boutiques, it could draw millions more tourists into Seattle and demonstrate that we are a city that knows how to wisely manage its wonderful natural scenic resources. Let's give Seattleites one more reason to go downtown, and let's give visitors one more reason to visit our beautiful city!

152

Comment

As it is a major part of the Seattle waterfront skyline, I would like to keep the viaduct as an aerial route. I personally enjoy taking this stretch of the highway for the views. I do think a widened version of the viaduct would decrease traffic problems, sometimes experienced on the viaduct.

153

Comment

My name is Diana Worth and I am 52 years old. I have lived in Ballard for about oh my goodness since about 1989 that's about 15 years and I drive on the viaduct a lot.

I say rebuild it because, it works, I like it, and it is aesthetically very pleasing. When you look in the paper and it talks about the loss of parking and increased travel times it seems to me the very best choice. So that's it, my name is Diana Worth and I am registered voter and have been for a long time if that makes any difference.

154

Comment

Hello my name is Lynn Jacobson and I live on Beacon Hill. I can be reached at 720.1006, but don't add my name to anything.

I am calling to urge that we adopt the tunnel alternative to replace the viaduct. I think we have a once in a lifetime chance to really alter the cityscape for the better here. Keeping the noise out and keep the views open and keeping the pedestrian sort of human size pedestrian access to the waterfront would just be a huge boon to the city, so, please tunnel, bye.

155

Comment

Yes I vote to replace it with the rebuild as an alternative. My name is Michael Wilson and I can be reached at 206.426.4508

156

Comment

Are you nuts?

Why do you ALWAYS have to propose the most expensive alternatives.

What would it cost to shore up the existing site? None of your alternatives are cost-efficient. All of them have a significant aspect of wishful thinking.

This is public planning at its absolute worst! The Boston Big Dig redux. You should all be embarrassed.

157

Comment

Dear Ms. Ray,

In regard to draft environmental impact statements concerning alternatives for the Alaskan Way Viaduct, I wish to go on record as strongly opposed to any option that includes a widened surface highway along the Seattle waterfront. Such a thing would be an environmental and urban monstrosity, cutting off the city from its waterfront for more effectively than the present viaduct does-not to mention its ancient predecessor, the much-maligned Railroad Avenue, with its mass of congested railroad tracks! Resultant lowOlying pollution, noise, and side-street traffic would further degrade the waterfront district. A widened surface highway along the waterfront would be a blight and a disaster.

I have serious doubts about the safety of a tunnel along the waterfront, given the nature of the topography and likelihood of serious earthquakes in our area.

I believe the cost, engineering, and environmental factors combine in favor of duplicating the present viaduct, to modern seismic standards. In a perfect world, there would be no highway along the waterfront at all, but the Alaskan Way Viaduct is something several generations have been accustomed to, and the traffic needs of the region have come to depend heavily upon. I therefore favor the in-kind rebuilding option for the viaduct, with continued use of the Battery Street Tunnel.

158

Comment

Just wanted to throw in 2 bits-

A key issue going forward is trying to maintain an balanced cost/benefit ratio for the public at large. Too often projects become paralyzed because there are natural constituencies in favor of and opposed to a project. In choosing between plans for the viaduct, financing should be distributed so that those receiving the benefits will incur the cost.

In more concrete terms, this means non-carpooling commuters should also be forced to pay a toll after the viaduct is complete. Also, property owners near the viaduct should pay for the higher cost of a tunnel option, perhaps through a special property tax downtown that is applied based on increases in assessed property value.

159

Comment

Dear Ms. Ray,

I reviewed the plans outlined in the morning Times. I personally feel that a tunnel will not only end up costing a great deal more, but be open to very serious problems in the event of an earthquake, and will cause numerous problems every single day, due to accidents. It will be more difficult for emergency personnel to reach and more expensive to build. I rather like the idea of widening Alaskan Way and making the Viaduct at street level, but I also know that parking will be lost and must be not only replaced but increased, perhaps by multi-level parking garages, low enough to protect the views, let them go underground!

(I have no sympathy whatsoever for those people who purchased property for the views. They knew the Viaduct was there and to serve the whims of a few pampered individuals at the tax payers expense is ridiculous, to say the very least.)

THE ONE THING I REALLY WANT TO STRESS IS;

PLEASE, PLEASE, AFTER OVER TWENTY YEARS OF PLANS AND WASTING THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS ON IDEAS, JUST DO IT!!!!!!FOR CRYING OUT LOUD.

The cost to replace/repair is only going to increase the longer we delay. Seattle would be hard pressed to exist without our beloved Viaduct-the idiots who planned I-5 thru downtown Seattle must have been drunk as well as dumb. Funneling five lanes of I-5, and four lanes of I-90 into one lane! I can only hope and pray that the new viaduct will have someone with common sense to plan on our ever increasing traffic flows.

Thank you for the opportunity to express my ideas and gripes.

160

Comment

I am in favor of the tunnel alternative. I travel on 99 regularly, from my home in Phinney Ridge to the airport and to downtown. It is a fantastic alternative to I-5. An efficient 99 keeps traffic away from I-5 and off the City streets that Ballard/Magnolia/Phinney Ridge neighbors have to drive to get to I-5 (i.e.. 50th St and 45th St, which are already too congested). I use it as a fast route and would no longer use it if it were at surface level and had stoplights through downtown.

I approve of improving Alaskan Way (this street should be used much more efficiently) as well, but not combining it with 99. Alaskan Way could be a great alternative for getting from downtown to Ballard (via the Ballard Bridge), Magnolia and Interbay, and would ease traffic congestion downtown (it would be great to be able to cut down to Alaskan Way and then to Elliott, on my way to Ballard, rather than weave through downtown streets and traffic).

Comment

What issues concern you the most about the Rebuild alternative?

The viaduct is a visual eyesore and an auditory assault. Downtown Seattle should be the most attractive city in the USA. The viaduct degrades the quality of Seattle by both sight and sound.

What issues concern you the most about the Aerial alternative?

It does not remove the noise and visually compromises Downtown Seattle.

What issues concern you the most about the Tunnel alternative?

This is the best alternative.

What issues concern you the most about the Bypass Tunnel alternative?

This is also a good alternative.

What issues concern you the most about the Surface alternative?

This is the worst alternative. This alternative would make noise pollution, visual pollution and pedestrian safety all worse. It would remove limited parking in the area.

What opportunities about these alternatives most interest you?

To finally have a downtown area that joins the city scene to the Elliot Bay viewscape.

Other Comments

Please get rid of the viaduct and surface alternatives, bury this road and restore Seattle to be the waterfront gem it should be.

162

Comment

What issues concern you the most about the Rebuild alternative?

This alternative doesn't address the problem of returning the waterfront to a more pleasing architecture.

What issues concern you the most about the Aerial alternative?

Same as above.

What issues concern you the most about the Tunnel alternative?

Doesn't give enough added cars (only a 19% increase). I like this proposal the best but you need to increase the ability to increase traffic.

What issues concern you the most about the Bypass Tunnel alternative?

Unacceptable from a traffic flow stand point.

What issues concern you the most about the Surface alternative?

Same as above

What opportunities about these alternatives most interest you?

Tunnel

163

Comment

I have to admit it is a tough call for me. I love the views that take your breath away during a routine drive. However I absolutely cannot stand the noise that destroys the waterfront experience in person. Should the tunnel option prevail, I am worried that it will be so built up that the open feel combined with the views will be lost. Since we must do something I vote for the option that makes our city more beautiful.

164

Comment

As a daily commuter along the Alaskan Way Viaduct - but also a student of history - I strongly encourage the City to opt for the Tunnel Alternative. I'll lose my scenic drive, but the Tunnel is the best long-term investment for Seattle. If we select the Aerial, Rebuild or Surface Alternatives, future generations will scorn us just as much as we pile insults today on the city planners who erected the Viaduct and cut off Seattle's waterfront from its downtown. Please make the best strategic decision and select the Tunnel Alternative!

165

Comment

To keep a eye on my tax dollars.....

166

Comment

What issues concern you the most about the Rebuild alternative?

Shorter Lifespan? Minimal Covered walkways. You know it rains around here.

What issues concern you the most about the Aerial alternative?

Minimal Covered walkways. You know it rains around here.

What issues concern you the most about the Tunnel alternative?

Time span No Covered walkways. You know it rains around here.

What issues concern you the most about the Bypass Tunnel alternative?

The Wall separating north and southbound traffic reduces flexibility for the option of expanding to a second tunnel later, like the tunnel alternative.

No covered walkways. You know it rains around here.

What issues concern you the most about the Surface alternative?

Traffic Nightmare. Congestion at the Ferry Terminal. Pedestrian and Bicycle access is least attractive.

What opportunities about these alternatives most interest you?

Adding metered parking, covered walkways, and bike paths will attract more people to the waterfront for recreation, tourism, and commerce

Comment

What issues concern you the most about the Rebuild alternative?

We have lived with this eyesore for 50 years. Admittedly, it has been, and still is, a very important 'traffic mover' in our city, but it is time to address that need in a much different way. In the early years of its existence, over the 'busy' railroad tracks and dividing the downtown business district from the industrialized 'working' waterfront, the viaduct was, perhaps, not the stigma it is today. However, our city has changed. Downtown has become much more than just a 'business district' (although that is vitally important and should be a major consideration in any viaduct alternative). Thousands of people once again live downtown (a trend I'd like to see continue to grow) and even more visit the 'city center' for ever increasing cultural / sports events and an evening 'on the town'. The waterfront has become a destination for residents, visitors, and business people. It's really the biggest downtown park Seattle has and it could become so much better (! Myrtle Edward's is wonderful, but how many people can get there on their lunch hour or want to stroll there after dark?). Downtown Seattle, in recent years, has become a very nice place to live - to call home. To rebuild "the wall" between downtown and the waterfront would be a major blunder. A 'black-eye' that would be there, for all to see, for a long time to come.

What issues concern you the most about the Aerial alternative?

It would be an even bigger eyesore than the present structure. And, with more traffic (and heavier trucks) a lot more noise would be generated. Seattle has been gifted with one of the most beautiful 'front doors' any city could ask for... Why ruin it by blocking it with a wall of concrete?

What issues concern you the most about the Tunnel alternative?

This alternative will probably present the greatest impact on waterfront access (cars, trucks, and people) during construction. I mean, after all, we are talking about one big ditch. Business, residents, and visitors will need to adjust and adapt -- and they will. Yes, it will cause some inconvenience but the gain will most definitely be worth the pain. I like the 'stacked' tunnel rather than the 'side by side' version. I think construction of it would reduce the amount of disruption in the area (and be a better seawall). However, cost and other construction issues might have considerably more to do with the version eventually (hopefully) selected so I'm open to input on the up/down or side/side version. However, a tunnel is definitely the way to go in my opinion.

What issues concern you the most about the Bypass Tunnel alternative?

If I read this one correctly, it still leaves far too much traffic on the surface. If you are going to build a tunnel, build it right.. A 'half and half' is not going to please anyone

What issues concern you the most about the Surface alternative?

The traffic performance and pollution issues with this option are a major concern. Stop and go traffic and up to three times the travel time. Has anyone given any thought to how much more air and noise pollution this will dump on the waterfront and the downtown area? The waterfront is a major 'pedestrian' location. Mixing a lot of surface traffic with that many people is asking for severe vehicle - pedestrian interaction (yes, even fatalities). Don't go there....

What opportunities about these alternatives most interest you?

We have a 'once in a lifetime' opportunity to do something for our city that will have an impact on Seattle for generations to come. So many times in our recent past, transportation and parks come to mind, we have let our children down. Yes, some of these viaduct 'alternatives' are expensive, but perhaps we should not be asking ourselves 'what's this going to cost me' but rather 'what's this going to cost them if we screw this up'.

Other Comments

I think that many of the benefits inherent in (or missing from) the various viaduct alternatives have been ignored in the EIS. OK, maybe not ignored, just omitted. Certainly, a reduction in noise and air pollution should be a consideration - a very important consideration. Aesthetic improvements are perhaps impossible to quantify, but no one can doubt that the dollar benefits to business (the tourist trade is no small entity in the local economy) and to property owners (yes, that relates to property taxes) should also be major considerations in this process. Beyond the dollar calculations, there are a number of 'quality of life' issues. They are not easy to put into a budget, and their value probably varies as much as our citizens do, but the cost/value is there never the less.

168

Comment

Dear Ms. Ray,

The "Cut and Cover" design was once discussed as an option for the AWV, yet currently I hear little about it. The semi-submerged feature of "Cut and Cover" (C&C) appears to me to have numerous important advantages:

1. Every expense estimate for C&C has been lower than either tunnel or viaduct designs, I believe.
2. As opposed to tunnel designs, the C&C design requires much simpler engineering against water seepage and much less expense for construction.
3. As opposed to viaduct designs, the C&C design has several advantages -
 - a. less expensive
 - b. does not divide downtown from the waterfront
 - c. does not block water vistas from downtown
 - d. is not an eyesore

Only a simple and low "hump" would divide downtown from the waterfront under the C&C design. I recommend it.

169

Comment

1) 99 is the second route through the city, other than I5. It is a necessary route, if for no other reason than as an option to I5 when that is gridlocked. Also, it is vital for people in West Seattle. Anyone driving from West Seattle to I5 can tell you how dangerous and jammed that route can be, especially when 99 is closed. Therefore, regardless of methodology the route must be maintained.

2) The silly monorail project, a waste of money, does not replace 99. Any thought that anyone will use the monorail instead of a road, is foolish. The monorail is not a viable option for a variety of reasons. a) does go anywhere necessary b) can't get to it to use it c) unsafe at night

3) I prefer replacing the existing structure. It can be higher, or lower, however, remember trains go under it. I do not support an expensive tunnel built in sawdust from Yeslers mill. I do not support a waterfront roadway. I've been on the one in San Francisco and it becomes totally gridlocked due to lights. We have the added problem of ferry traffic and sports related traffic. All of which would impact a surface street.

4) I'm not sure why the seawall must be done at the same time, but if so, then do it.

5) Most importantly, I drive on the old viaduct every week and it will collapse in a pancake mode. It will cost the city a great deal more to settle the lawsuits when people die because it collapsed. So whatever is to be done, should be done ASAP, not waiting for the collapse.

170

Comment

The viaduct has long been a sore spot in our City beauty, it's extremely noisy and dirty. This is a wonderful opportunity to build a Tunnel which would allow us to develop a beautiful waterfront that would enhance our City. I use the viaduct, and would pay a toll to help pay for additional costs for a tunnel.

171

Comment

I believe the surface option should be selected based on the price and the time needed to complete the project. I use the viaduct every day and we need to find a way that will be the least disruptive for the shortest period of time.

172

Comment

I truly believe that the rebuild alternative is the better of the alternatives.

173

Comment

Thanks for the chance to comment on the plans being considered to replace the viaduct. I am definitely in favor of the plan to build the six lane tunnel. I assume this will include rebuilding the sea-wall as well. I live in West Seattle and use the viaduct all the time, so that the 7 to 9 years to build the tunnel will have an impact no doubt, but it has to be done.

The project will give West Seattle folks a reason to ride the new monorail system and add significantly to the ridership of that project.

I say it is time to make a decision and get on with it. Delay will only add to the costs. Another benefit of the tunnel project is that it will open up the space between downtown and the waterfront. We may get some needed greenspace yet!!

Again, thanks for the chance to comment.

Ron Richardson ron.richardson@comcast.net

174

Comment

How are we going to avoid a major traffic catastrophe when 99 finally closes for the project?

175

Comment

I would like you to take very seriously the issue of view accessibility. Over the last 20 years, we have seen so many tall buildings built all along the western edge of downtown. A person used to be able to see glorious views of the sound and the Olympics from almost anywhere downtown during the course of their business day. Now, you rarely catch a glimpse through the crack between two tall buildings. And on the waterfront, so many more tall buildings have been built that views are getting harder and harder to find. So we are coming to a point where only the people wealthy enough to get up high above the heads of the others have the benefit of being reminded on a daily basis what a glorious place we live in. The viaduct is the last place where the common person can feel the glory of this beautiful spot on the earth. Driving along the viaduct is a two minute meditation in beauty and the changing landscape of mountain, cloud and sky. I'm not saying that I'm not keeping ! my eye on the road, but we all enjoy crossing the I-90 bridge and seeing the spectacular view of Mt. Rainier when it's out, and the view from the viaduct beats that hands down. If we put the viaduct underground, then there goes the last unobstructed view of the sound that the less than wealthy get. I, personally, hate the idea of being in an underground tunnel. Particularly if there were a traffic jam as there is almost daily on that stretch of road. But I can also see the benefit of having the viaduct gone and a wide open expanse of park and people space along the waterfront. But that's not what is going to happen, is it? What will happen if the viaduct is put underground is that all that space will be sold to wealthy people who will put up tall buildings and those of us not wealthy enough to be invited up there, will never see our beautiful sound and mountains from downtown again. Except for the rare crack between their monoliths. If you do decided to put a tunnel ! in, I must say I will fight to keep developers off that space. The people of Seattle have a right to enjoy this beautiful view. Don't sell our heritage. Seattle belongs to all of us.

176

Comment

The traffic congestion in and out of the downtown area is well recognized as a major detriment to the city's image. After reading the article in the Seattle Times regarding the options being offered, and seeing the estimated average speeds and traffic times for the various alternatives, I believe the tunnel alternative provides the fastest movement of traffic through town. In the future I would expect the volume of traffic will only increase and these speeds and times will end up being overstated.

I base this opinion on the experience with I-5, I-405, and the Evergreen Point Bridge. I have been a resident in the Seattle area for 52 years, saw these highways built, and have seen the traffic on these highways become a disaster. I do not know the estimated life of a highway, but I believe they need to be constructed to handle estimated volumes fifty years in the future. Even the tunnel alternative doesn't seem to have been designed with this life span in mind. But, based on the speeds and times given, it does seem to be the option able to handle the highest volume. I would select this even though it carries the highest price tag and the longest construction time.

177

Comment

I am very concerned about the possible conversion of the viaduct and adjacent area into a surface street. Such a conversion would be incompatible with a multimodal pedestrian focused waterfront. Minimization and mitigation for the extensive noise and safety issues presented by this alternative would be virtually impossible. These impacts would reduce the historical and touristic value of Seattle's waterfront and degrade property values in the vicinity.

To rebuild the viaduct with another aerial structure presents similar challenges. Such a roadway is not visionary. It reduces property values along its eastern margins through continued degraded views, and makes the waterfront appear 'stuck' in a 1950's design mentality.

The tunnel options provide the best alternative(s) for through-traffic, and provide a excellent opportunity to transition into a seamless transportation corridor with the Mercer Street tunnel. They enhance neighborhood property values by developing views and segregate pedestrian and vehicular traffic in this tourist area.

I would support either tunnel option as effective for the future transportation and city design needs of Seattle.

178

Comment

I am for the three lane tunnel in each direction. The costs are competitive and this alternate opens up space at the waterfront. Too many times in the past we have built cheaper alternates and have suffered long term consequences. I say build the tunnel.

179

Comment

I want us to keep the viaduct as it is my favorite roadway in Seattle. I travel it both to and from work daily and appreciate the beauty it provides me.

I would like for us to upgrade it in the most cost effective manner in a way that will have the least impact on commuters.

KEEP OUR VIADUCT!

180

Comment

The tunnel option is best. This is our one chance to reclaim the waterfront for people, not cars. I also don't favor widening Alaska Way - four lanes is plenty.

Let's make the waterfront an inviting, pedestrian-friendly area where Seattle citizens will want to go. The tunnel option will accomplish this.

181

Comment

As a former downtown resident I believe a community friendly water front design is critically important in this process. For this reason I prefer the tunnel alternative with the surface alternative as a second best option.

My preference for a surface alternative in the absence of sufficient funding for the tunnel would be to mirror the designs of the San Francisco, CA and Vancouver, B.C. waterfront traffic designs where they do not overly detract from the pedestrian experience. The San Francisco analogy appears particularly apt given the loss of the Embarcadero closely parallels the risks we face with the viaduct.

Consideration should also be given to not having a water-front surface option at all and simply routing traffic into the core downtown streets (2d and 4th Ave.). This would also parallel the experience of entering Vancouver, B.C. where the freeways terminate on surface level streets. While I recognize the transit time impact of this option, it is likely to be of lower cost than the surface alternative now contemplated and would be as close to a.

182

Comment

I am very much in favor of this project. Removing the viaduct and replacing it with a tunnel along a portion of the waterfront thru downtown would be a huge benefit to the City.

I am against retrofitting the Viaduct or replacing it with an aerial structure. A primary purpose of this project should be to create a more livable, beautiful waterfront.

Replacing portions of the Seawall that are failing is a good idea - but replacing the Seawall in total as part of this project may be too costly.

The Viaduct is no more vulnerable to earthquakes than many other bridges and buildings in the City - seismic concerns are easy to express, but not the best rational for this project.

This project and the improving capacity of the 520 crossing of Lake Washington are the two most feasible, major transportation improvements we can make in the region.

Hopefully our political leaders can find significant federal money to help make these projects happen. Also many property owners near the Viaduct would benefit from increased property values - hopefully they could contribute significant funds to the project.

183

Comment

I think the Bypass Tunnel Alternative is the best solution because it is a compromise between cost and effectiveness. I also like it because it addresses the problem with the sea wall. It is a solution that is not technically complex consequently I think planners should be able to reasonably estimate and manage the projected costs.

184

Comment

I feel that either of the tunnel alternatives would be the best solution to this project.

185

Comment

While I would prefer the tunnel option, I am uncertain as to whether we can afford it. Therefore it seems to me that there needs to be an examination of a higher-capacity variation on the surface alternative. I suggest that a 10 lane variation be looked at.

According to the EIS the total width of the right of way is 156 feet. The actual width of the Waterfront Trolley cross-ties is 8 feet. The EIS shows two bike lanes at 6 feet each; one is adequate. It shows a service lane at 13 feet; an 11 foot lane (same as the surface lanes) is adequate. It shows non-service parking on the east of the ROW; this can be accommodated off-site. Below is one iteration of a higher capacity surface option, starting from the existing promenade

feet
8 streetcar
8 service parking (pedestrian island at cross-walks)
11 service lane
6 bike lane
6 pedestrian island
55 five surface lanes (south-bound)
7 pedestrian island
55 five surface lanes (north-bound)

156

Obviously other iterations are possible.

186

Comment

Go with the long tunnel. Its the most expensive, but the noise reduction will be worth the cost. Rs

187

Comment

I am adamantly opposed to the surface alternative or any other alternative that would decrease the flow of traffic provided by the existing viaduct. I live in Magnolia and the viaduct is a vital link for those in my neighborhood, individuals and businesses. Decreasing traffic flow and rerouting into already clogged downtown streets and I-5 makes no sense. The cost savings do not justify the loss. The issues regarding the other alternatives are not as troubling to me. Thank you.

188

Comment

I sure don't. It was substantially longer than the clip below. I'd have to recreate it from scratch. The gist of it was urging you to go with the Tunnel option, and to preserve access to Ballard/Interbay *without* having to cross BNSF tracks at grade, preferably via ramps at Elliott and Western. Train traffic by all estimates will be increasing significantly (both freight and passenger), and the Broad St. crossing is already frequently a mess. I further think it could be a congestion disaster to dump current Ballard/Interbay traffic onto Alaskan Way from Pike to Broad, even if aided by a railroad underpass at Broad (which also might ruin the aesthetics of that portion of the waterfront and the SAM sculpture park).

I did save one piece of it intact, because I sent it separately as a question:

"Approaching the Battery St tunnel from the south, how is it possible to go from a below-grade tunnel to an aerial structure clearing the BNSF tracks in such a short space? This presumably requires rising 40-50 feet in just a short city block from roughly Pike to Virginia. Plus even more vertical to clear Elliott, if that's the plan. It's a little hard to see the route in detail on the website, so I'd appreciate if you could clarify this point."

Thanks -- Bill Sornsin

189

Comment

For the health, safety, and welfare of Seattle and Washington State residents, as well as visitors, taking down the viaduct and replacing it with a tunnel is the only solution that will really meet the long term needs of all types of users.

Don't view this as just a safety fix or a transportation capacity issue, it has far reaching implications on the city's growth and therefore the region and the State.

190

Comment

April 2, 2004

Dear Sir:

I request a comment for of and about as well as respectfully to the Alaskan Way Viaduct, Seattle Waterfront Seawall, Seattle Monorail, and discussion concerning a tunnel proponent. To repairs, upgrade earthquake damage, renovation, new improved traffic control and flow for pedestrians and public transportation in and around the facade of Seattle and waterfront. Please send long term plans, blue prints, contracts, and any additional explanation for the Elliott Bay makeover.

191

Comment

I am not in favor of the Tunnel Alternative.

I am very unhappy with how long it takes for a decision to be made on how the Viaduct will be replaced.

It will be a big mess once the replacement starts, but it would be nice to see some progress being made.

192

Comment

Dear Allison,

Thank you for this Alaskan Way Viaduct and Seawall Replacement Project summary. I found it to be very helpful and informative. Thank you. I am glad that there is some kind of a schedule and a plan for a final design solution this summer. I want to suggest that you incorporate planning and allocation for parking in the design process. We will need at least as much and hopefully more parking to accommodate the growth in the use of a more accessible and more attractive waterfront. To this end, a cut and cover tunnel could provide space for pedestrian walking as well as multi-level parking. Additional parking would provide access as well as income to the city by way of parking fees. The present design has had a 50 year life. The replacement needs to have a 100 year life to be cost effective. In the event that the roadway portion of the plan is delayed, we must go forward with the seawall portion of the project. If the seawall fails it will cause serious damage to downtown Seattle.

193

Comment

I think that surface option would be the best because the next time there is an earthquake it would be the easiest to fix. And if the plan coordinates with the sounder train they should just switch over to use the sounder train every hour during the construction time and maybe enough people will be converted during the construction that they won't need the maximum amount of roadways while they're doing the thing. Thank you bye.

194

Comment

Hi this is Eldon Davis, I live in Des Moines and I use the 509 freeway from Burien up to North Seattle once a week.

My question is or wonderment is;

I have never seen in any of the articles covering the replacement of the viaduct. What is to be done with 110,000 cars a day that use the viaduct? What roads will we be moved onto, will we be all moved over to I-5, will any surface streets in the middle of Seattle be designated for north south traffic non stop?

So I feel that's been ignored not telling people what's going to happen to those cars which I am one of. Thanks very much. 206.824.2215.

195

Comment

I read the Seattle times article and of the alternatives I prefer either the rebuild or the aerial. You can have gorgeous landscaping and parks all over the place but there is only one place that has that gorgeous unobstructed view of the Olympics and the water and the ferry boats and that is that viaduct, so it's a strong vote for either rebuild or aerial.

Maxine Keysling of Woodinville, thank you goodbye.

196

Comment

Why not build a bridge type structure out in the water, that would go high enough so it wouldn't obstruct the shipping in there, the Piers could be at the end of the Pier docks or some place so it wouldn't interfere with the Piers at all. A bridge like structure I don't think would cost as much as what you contemplate doing right now.

197

Comment

I doubt this will do any good, especially with the people you have on the leadership group. First off a tunnel would be great, however I don't believe your costs are realistic at all. No tunnel project in Seattle has been anywhere close to its budget. To believe that a tunnel is only going to be marginally more expensive than other alternatives means there is really a Santa Claus. The Puget Sound area has forego its right to build a project with all the bells and whistles because of lack of planning and building of transportation infrastructure. Now we do because we can't delay any longer. Build the aerial option. Downtown doesn't need the view and the waterfront will do just fine on its own. You should actually build an expanded aerial on 99 from county line to county line. Make it a 4 or 5 lane limited access freeway. Bus only, HOV and 2-3 general purpose lanes would actually make an improvement in traffic. What is the area going to do when another million and a half more people move into the area in the next twenty years. Sound transit is clueless. The Monorail is being drowned by you people. Show some leadership and guts. Show the people a project that will get us on top of transportation. Elevation is the key. Make it a toll road. So what if it takes 10-15 years and 10-15 billion dollars. Like I said we have given up our rights to make pleasant looking alternatives, by not doing enough earlier. Get cross town traffic off the surface streets. Aerial is the only realistic option. Besides the Port of Seattle could interconnect its rail and sea distribution points dramatically. For those people who complain about the viaduct blocking their view, think about the 100,000 plus people a day who enjoy the view while driving on the viaduct. I am one of them.

Sincerely,
Pat Petersen

198

Comment

Yes I just wanted to say that I would like to have the Alaskan Way Viaduct rebuilt. Thank you.

199

Comment

Yes my wife and I are strongly in favor of the first alternative on the viaduct that is the rebuilding phase. Which would essentially leave the viaduct intact at the end. We are in favor of this because of the view aspects. Visitors coming from and going to the airport as well as local residents who don't live downtown and don't have an opportunity to see the beautiful harbor and feel that it is not caused a separation between the Alaskan way area and the rest of the city. So please record us in that regard and please we hope the rebuild process will be the one that is chosen. My name is Todd Vast and I live in Ballard.

200

Comment

The Draft EIS reads like an editorial piece with conclusions that are contradictory to facts outlined in the introduction.

example: Conclusions regarding the loss of free parking space are specious at best.

example: under south end alternatives I 90 connections are described as nearby and important yet no version includes direct connection nor mentions the benefits of linking these major freeways.

With out a doubt there will be no opportunities in the future to add general traffic.

201

Comment

To whom it may concern-

As an architect with experience in urban planning and citizen of Seattle I strongly support the tunnel alternative. The benefits of moving the traffic and noise under a lid and repairing the seawall at the same time are immense. The city has no promenade along the waterfront which will make it so much more enjoyable for Seattleites as well as tourists. I have worked downtown (Pioneer Square) for over 6 years and have a detailed knowledge of the area. Please do not let budgetary concerns alone drive the decision process here. Seattle needs a well designed edge to the water. The payoff is a long term one. A chance to do it right at an urban scale like this one doesn't come along very often and I hope we won't miss this opportunity.

Sincerely
Carsten Stinn

202

Comment

the project is moving to slow and I favor the tunnel options, the lowered aurora north of the tunnel with over passes. the government needs to help pay for this vital route.

203

Comment

Please rebuild or build an aerial alternative. Enjoying the terrific views in one of the reasons I like living in Seattle. Plus I find it an excellent way to get where I'm going and avoid the freeway hassles. NO Tunnels please. If I wanted a tunnel, I can stay home in my dark and dingy basement.

;))

204

Comment

It seems to me the rebuild is the best alternative. It is one of the lower costing options and it moves the most traffic. The tunnel choices are more expensive and probably have a higher risk of cost overruns. Also, many people, including myself, like to show off the Seattle skyline to visitors by arriving via the viaduct. Sydney, Australia has shown that the waterfront can still be beautiful with a viaduct. The surface option is not practical at all. It will not move enough traffic and it will cut off the waterfront from the rest of downtown.

205

Comment

It is my longstanding belief that the Tunnel Alternative is the best alternative for traffic, improvement of the downtown Seattle area and in the long run, the most efficient use of funds.

Unlike many large cities, the downtown area of Seattle is NOT its best feature. There are many competing interests along Alaska Way. This project offers the opportunity to develop a beautiful link between the downtown area and the waterfront. Its time that seeing downtown Seattle close-up is better than seeing it from a ferry in the middle of the Sound. While I have to admit that there are some beautiful views from the Alaska Way viaduct, it is quite obvious that sightseeing in the middle of a highway is an extreme hazard.

Placing the highway underground will allow so much better use of the surface, and elevated viewing sites can be developed to make a visit to the Seattle waterfront a genuinely enjoyable experience.

206

Comment

why do we need a tunnel? the only folks who will prosper from this will be the wealthy land developers and the years of construction workers...

Those of us who will use the viaduct will be underground, unhappy and unable to change anything.

I think it stinks that the beauty of the overhead road with it's gorgeous view of the sound is being fought, and again, it smells of money and not what really is best for the people.

207

Comment

I think this is the best alternative available. While the tunnel alternative is also reasonable, I feel it is too massive and costly and would probably devolve into a Boston Central Artery type mess because of the difficult construction conditions on the waterfront. I feel a smaller bypass for through traffic and an improved surface Alaskan Way for local traffic, plus the new seawall, will be the best project for the buck. Thanks

208

Comment

(1) The Tunnel alternatives are the best. But why not keep the same capacity as now - 2 lanes each way in the tunnel and on the surface? This would save money and keep the surface a much friendly place - 6 lanes on the surface is way too much, especially since 4 does just fine now.

(2) The bike lanes sandwiched between car traffic and parked cars are a very bad idea for such a prime tourist-oriented area (danger, noise, general unpleasantness). There should be separated bike paths - switch the location of the parking and bike lanes, adding a planting strip between them. On one side the bike path could run near the waterfront streetcar, as it does today. On the other side it could be near the sidewalk. Design the bike path on the waterfront side for slower cyclists and families, with the bike path on the downtown side for faster cyclists.

(3) Parking (short term) should be only on the downtown side of the surface highway, not on the waterfront side, where it will detract from the park-like environment. Instead have a pick-up / drop-off lane on the waterfront side.

209

Comment

I favor this solution as the best long term investment for the city. Opening the city to the waterfront brings incredible development opportunities and has the potential to increase the quality of life for downtown residents, visitors and employees. The loss of parking under the existing viaduct will be a hardship to the area businesses - but perhaps there is a plan in place for that. I will certainly miss the wonderful views from the top deck of the viaduct, but in the long run, it would be a service to the city to remove the vehicle traffic (and with it it's exhaust/particulates/noise pollution) from the waterfront.

210

Comment

I am strongly for the tunnel alternative. We need to invest in a solution that would add dramatically to the beauty and public use of downtown Seattle. Tightening our belt and paying the cost now will be repaid a million-fold in the enjoyment both the citizens of Seattle and tourists will receive for generations to come. It would be tragic to saddle our city with another ugly highway in the sky. The loss of view for drivers is minimal since it is difficult to look at things while you're driving in traffic. But being able to walk in an open area adjacent to the waterfront and the attractions of the downtown area will enrich the city immeasurably. We need to follow the lead of Vancouver and Portland if we are not to end up another squalid city caught in the shackles of the automobile.

211

Comment

I live in West Seattle and commute to the University/Sand Point area daily. I split my commute between driving my car and riding the bus, depending on work assignments. SR99 is an essential route for me with either transit option.

SR99 provides the fastest transit time for me during the morning and evening high-capacity commute times. SR520/I-5 is excessively difficult from the University area due to the interweave near Mercer and high number of traffic accidents. Surface streets through downtown also cause long delays due to high capacity, pedestrians, and numerous stoplights. Alaska Way is also congested due to ferry traffic.

My average drive time from Sand Point area to West Seattle during morning/evening commute:

SR99 : 15-20 minutes

SR520/I5 : 30-40 minutes

Downtown surface streets: 45-60 minutes

Alaska Way/surface streets: 45-60 minutes

Bus Transit (3 buses, change downtown and university): 90-120 minutes

I recommend the following as the best options:

#1 choice: Rebuild with at-grade option for South

#2 choice: Aerial with at-grade option for South

My top 2 choices seem the most efficient in terms of cost, construction time, and safety. It leaves parking spaces and pedestrian access open to the waterfront and keeps freight traffic away from pedestrians. It also keeps Alaska Way as a viable alternative in case of a traffic accident on SR99 and/or I5.

Though the tunnel idea is interesting, the prohibitive cost makes it unviable. Given the number of tall buildings surrounding the current viaduct, I don't believe the tunnel options will provide a great deal of visual improvement. I enjoy spending time along the waterfront and do not believe the viaduct is an eyesore or too loud. The lack of parking with the option is also a consideration.

The surface option is a terrible alternative. It would create a traffic mess, remove valuable parking space, and completely ruin the convenient pedestrian access to the waterfront.

With the aerial alternative, is the widened Mercer underpass absolutely necessary? If not, could this option be removed to save cost/time and possibly be presented as a separate improvement under a different transportation plan?

Given the poor soil stability, new research about the Seattle fault, and recent tsunami hazard map from DNR, the waterfront and Central area are particularly prone to natural hazards. Replacing the seawall needs to happen as quickly as possible, and therefore a cost- and time-efficient plan is crucial to obtaining federal, state, and local funds. Keeping multiple evacuation routes open to pedestrians and traffic are also important.

212

Comment

I favor the rebuild alternative over all the other options presented in the Draft EIS. The existing viaduct is an efficient transportation artery and minimally intrusive compared to most of the other alternatives. Advocates of the tunnel option depict the viaduct as a hulking monster squatting on what would otherwise be pristine waterfront. In fact, most of the area is working waterfront, given over to industrial use. Tearing down the viaduct would open up a few blocks for the development of parks and other amenities, for the enjoyment of a few thousand residents and tourists; but it would also deprive hundreds of thousands of drivers and passengers of some of the best views in the city.

213

Comment

I think the way the surface option opens up the area between downtown and its waterfront is amazing. It is so dark there now.

What I am curious about is:

(1) where are we going to replace the parking and how are we going to deal with how the city streets enter into the new surface alternative?

(2) If we decide to get rid of this efficient thoroughfare, how will we maintain or improve it (efficiently- i.e. maintain non stopping) on the surface safely while still keeping the pier and downtown connected for pedestrians and drivers?

Thank you for asking.

214

Comment

I think that this project affords a tremendous opportunity to reclaim the Seattle waterfront for pedestrians. I think the tunnel alternative is by far the best option. The benefits are tremendous - opening up views, quieting the waterfront, creating park space (over the tunnel), and reconnecting the waterfront to the downtown core. Despite the higher cost, I am in favor of the tunnel alternative.

By the way, why is not replacing the viaduct with anything an alternative? Portland did this to great acclaim; their waterfront is beautiful and very accessible. I would also consider this option.

215

Comment

I wish to vote for the viaduct alternatives. I vote for the tunnel alternative that will take 7 to 9 years and cost \$3.8 to 4.1 billion.

216

Comment

You provide no proof that strengthening the existing structure is not viable. California has used composites to strengthen many of their freeways and bridges. I suspect the cost to repair using composites would be the cheapest solution.

217

Comment

I believe that the Tunnel Alternative is the way to go. Yes, it may cost more and take slightly longer than the others, but this alternative shows the most VISION. The downtown waterfront is one of Seattle's best assets. This is an opportunity to restore Seattle's waterfront properly, and it should not be squandered.

218

Comment

Like the cross-section views of the different alternatives. Gives a good feel about how it will actually affect the waterfront area.

219

Comment

1. The current configuration is something I like. I like the free access that everyone has to the world class views of Elliott Bay, Puget Sound and the Olympics.

2. If we go with a tunnel, I think we must raise taxes on any property owner who realizes a windfall gain once the viaduct comes down. It would be

wrong for a private property owner to benefit from this public project. If they do, we should tax them as a way to recoup the costs of the project. This would be complicated public policy but well worth the effort. The (1989?) earthquake in San Francisco offers a nice natural experiment of what

happens to property values when a viaduct comes down.

Peter House

220

Comment

As daily drivers on the AWW, we DO NOT WANT the Tunnel Options. Tunnels are not a safe nor cost-effective ways to deliver products and have other negative transportation /economic impacts.

The two options we think best for all transportation and most cost effective are: rebuild in-kind or replace with the aerial option, with the more lane options.

The Seawall must be fixed, no matter what option is done.

221

Comment

Hello John Worthington in Seattle commenting about the viaduct. I have to see it underground and it has to be three each way pretty much like it is now. I guess if I open up this I will say I support the tunnel, the six-way tunnel beneath Alaskan Way. And I also I believe that it should be part of the project to move the ferry to either West Seattle or Magnuson Park. Somewhere else. I think it just dumps a bunch of traffic in the middle of the streets. I know it's an institution with Wendy and Mara and Wonderdog and all that, but now is the time since the moll borers have taken their course I would like to see them consider moving it to West Seattle since the West Seattle freeway is right there to accommodate the traffic a little easier. I just think it also makes a better look in our backyard or our front porch or however you want to call it the front porch the downtown project. I think they should be linked and I think that you should shoot for open spaces and usable spaces by the stadiums and cover the viaduct where you can.

That's my comment and I am sticking to it. I need a viaduct underneath I don't want to not build it at all, I have heard some people say on top. We have no other option but to build the tunnel so we can create the waterfront that we are looking to create to attract an or be an international destination. I think it is just imperative that the

222

Comment

Dear Allison Ray,
How these needed replacement projects lag!
Why don't we open them up to local biddings and save taxpayers money??
Down the line these is always going to be better roads.
It never seems to happen!
I came to Seattle in 1962 and little has changed in this narrow land corridor!!
Your truly.

223

Comment

Do this project properly. Please use a tunnel alternative and think about doing this project in conjunction with the seawall. I work in the Federal Building between First and Second Avenues. If done properly, this project will enhance the City of Seattle for generations. The Alaska Way viaduct is antiquated and outdated and will result in many unnecessary deaths if we are hit with a big earthquake. It will not survive another big one like the one we had a few years ago.

224

Comment

Mayor, Perhaps I simply missed it among the alternatives considered for rebuilding the viaduct, but has a combination viaduct/tunnel been considered? Rather than an "all above the surface" or "all below the surface," construct one level of viaduct with traffic going in one direction and one depth of tunnel with traffic going in the other direction, both within the existing footprint of the current viaduct. It reduces the height of the double viaduct option and reduces the cost of the tunnel only option, while not impinging on lateral uses. With current technology, a new viaduct does not have to seem so "big" and intrusive. In fact, the surface area under the viaduct could be landscaped/shaped in a way that enhances its use and brightens up the area currently in the shadows of the current structure. Seems to me it mitigates some of the view and cost concerns. Sincerely, Karl Kraber

225

Comment

April 6, 2004

Allison Ray
WSDOT Environmental Coordinator
Alaskan Way Viaduct and Seawall Replacement Project
999 Third Avenue, Suite 2424
Seattle, WA 98104

Comments: Alaskan Way Viaduct and Seawall Replacement Project

Your March 2004 bulletin requested comments on the five Viaduct Alternatives.

REBUILD is the preferred alternative followed by AERIAL. The REBUILD retains the beautiful view of the city while traveling over the waterfront and provides easy access to First Avenue and the Waterfront from under the Viaduct parking. The Viaduct has withstood several earthquakes and major fires therefore the original concept has stood the test of time.

TUNNEL. Neither TUNNEL alternative is acceptable. The cost, construction time delay, lack of beauty, underwater hazard and earthquake risk make these alternatives unacceptable. We will never use the tunnels!

Surface. The surface option will invite pedestrian accidents and wipe out the Waterfront businesses. Philadelphia has a similar surface plan between the Independence Mall and the Delaware River waterfront. While Independence Mall has attracted millions, access to the waterfront is difficult due to the expressway in between. Several historic ships are in the waterfront, otherwise tourist business is lacking and the area is an eyesore.

There seems to be a lack of concern regarding the TIME FRAME of 6 to 11 years. This long construction delay will have a serious impact on downtown business in addition to waterfront and tourist business. Impact causes accelerated actual depreciation of building values and the permanent loss of a substantial share of your property tax revenue. Have you considered an accelerated cost and time frame to keep your business base alive? Philadelphia has miles of abandoned business operations due to a similar faulted business concept. The downtown business heart of Tacoma was also destroyed several years ago by similar civic improvement. All the businesses moved to the Tacoma Mall in the suburbs.

Sincerely,

Dan Caldwell
19547 Second Ave. S.
Des Moines, 98148

226

Comment

April 7, 2004

Mayor's Office
Seattle City Hall
P.O. Box 94749
Seattle, WA 98124-4749

Dear Mayor Nickols,

I read the detailed article in the April 1st edition of the Seattle Times about the potential solutions for replacing the Alaskan Way Viaduct. The article outlined five different options. The last portion of the article said that you were interested in public comment about the options.

I am in favor of either of these options: by-passing Alaska Way or proposing a tunnel. In my opinion, any alternative options which create a barrier between the waterfront and the City should be avoided. This will probably be our opportunity to do it right for current and future Seattle generations in a manner for which the City can always be proud.

By the way, the article stated that there are folks who claim they enjoy the view from the freeway and would hate to lose it. I'm sure that most would agree that creating a view for drivers should not be a serious consideration in the final decision making process. It's better to make sure that the whole City and its visitors benefit rather than the drivers.

Sincerely,

John W. Jacobi

227

Comment

April 8, 2004

Allison Ray
WSDOT Environmental Coordinator
Alaskan Way Viaduct and Seawall Replacement Project
999 Third Ave., Suite 2424
Seattle, WA 98104

With regard to the five alternatives under consideration, I prefer the rebuild. It does the job, is the least expensive and preserves the view for the thousands of motorist every day. I am a West Seattle resident and use the viaduct at least 2 to 3 times a week, and I always enjoy the view as I drive, not many cities can boast of such a beautiful drive. My second choice would be the Aerial.

Sincerely yours,

Leon A. Harmen
8465 Tillicom Rd SW
Seattle, WA 98136

228

Comment

The rebuild makes the most sense as it is one of the cheapest alternatives, offers a save of an historic site and will be built the fastest. Living in W Seattle it is imperative that the Viaduct stay in tact and to be upgraded and rebuilt as soon as possible. The other alternatives seems wasteful and will cause more congestion in the long run. The elevated highway is the only way to go. THANKS

Comment

April 8, 2004 I tried to send my comments to you earlier regarding the “SR 99 – Alaskan Way Viaduct and Seawall Replacement Project,” but your website’s email system crashed on me unexpectedly. It has been necessary to rewrite my comments entirely. Please forgive the length of this communication, but I believe it is necessary that I state, in general terms, the full case. I find all of the alternatives for this project to be thoroughly analyzed, studied and professionally presented. In my opinion, however – and the opinion of others I know – none of them satisfactorily resolve the current Viaduct/seawall problems AND potential development opportunities that currently exist in the waterfront district. (Please forgive me for being so blunt, but I and others believe this to be the truth.) The famous, Finish architect, Aero Saranin (sp?), the designer of St. Louis’ Gateway Arch, among other noted projects, stated it this way: “The solution lies in the problem.” What he meant by that statement is that any solution (including the best available solution) to a problem is determined by how that problem is defined. The narrower and more detailed a problem’s definition, the fewer the possible solutions and the less likely that the final, selected solution will actually be the “best” one available. On the other hand, the broader a problem’s definition, the more likely that the best available solution will be found. Most new inventions have been created in this fashion – i.e., by defining the problem in a manner that leads to new, original and improved solutions. The City of Seattle has defined the Viaduct/seawall and waterfront “problem(s)” generally as follows: ‘The Alaskan Way Viaduct and portions of the waterfront seawall need to be replaced. Which of the following alternatives should be adopted: 1) a direct replacement of the existing, elevated Viaduct, 2) demolition of the existing Viaduct and construction of a new vehicular traffic system at ground level, 3) demolition of the Viaduct and construction of a tunnel for vehicular traffic below ground level, or 4) a combination of any or all of the above? All four alternatives shall also contain the necessary repairs to the seawall.’ (There may be one or more alternatives that I have not accurately described above, but let’s assume, for the sake of argument, that there are currently only these four.) Because of the way the problem has been defined, the currently available solutions have been limited to these four basic “alternatives.” The obvious question arises: Have all of the feasible alternatives (solutions) been analyzed and presented for final consideration? The answer is NO. More importantly, the selection of one of these four alternatives could severely limit and adversely affect all future development in Seattle’s waterfront district. All four of these alternatives would be tremendously expensive. All four of them would take a very long period of time to complete (7 to 11 years) before the new structures would be full operational. The economic impact on businesses and facilities located along the waterfront would be absolutely devastating because of the long time periods during which they would be totally “cut-off” from convenient access to the City’s CBD. As a result, many of the private establishments in waterfront area would likely go out of business. The vehicular traffic that is currently served by the Viaduct would have to be totally diverted to other routes for nearly the entire duration of the new construction. None of these four alternatives comprehensively addresses the other uses, buildings and facilities that currently exist along the waterfront, except for portions of the seawall. The tunnel alternative – the most expensive and time-consuming of the four – is the only one that provides significantly more developable land surface area than what currently exists today. And finally, regardless of the alternative eventually selected, its long-term effects on future development will be IRREVERSIBLE. So, let us try defining the problem differently, as follows: ‘What is the best way to quickly and efficiently move vehicular traffic through and/or around the waterfront district of central Seattle, and what is the best way to develop that area for future use?’ By defining the problem in this manner, the number and variations of possible alternatives (solutions) is greatly expanded, and a broader scope of potential development opportunities arises. A “fifth alternative,” resulting from the revised problem definition just stated, is the subject of this message to you. It can be generally described as follows: The concept for this fifth alternative involves the construction of a new vehicular traffic conveying structure that would extend out into Elliot Bay and COMPLETELY BYPASS THE WATERFRONT AREA. This “bypass structure” would be essentially linear in form and would be connected on land to both the Battery Street Tunnel and the southern end of the existing Viaduct. A totally new, protected “inner harbor” would thus be created. Close to the middle of the new bypass structure, an elevated bridge would be provided to allow water traffic into and out of the inner harbor. Vehicles traveling through town – i.e., the existing Viaduct traffic – would ultimately be directed onto the bypass structure, thus relieving the waterfront district of all such traffic. Vehicles traveling to and from the waterfront would be directed along Alaska Way and Western Avenue. The new bypass structure itself could be supported on floats, submerged piles and/or a combination of the two. The demolition of the Alaskan Way Viaduct could take place at any point after the north and south bypass structure connections are completed. The entire Viaduct area would therefore be made available for future development. In addition to conveying vehicular traffic, the new bypass structure could have new “surface elements” appended to it that could accommodate other uses, mostly on its protected inner harbor side. Thus, the surface area that could support additional development would be expanded dramatically beyond the total land area (real estate) that would be recovered by demolishing the Viaduct. This solution would be the LEAST EXPENSIVE alternative, primarily because portions of the new bypass structure’s surface elements could be leased out or sold to help defray the project’s costs. 95% to 98% of the new bypass structure could be constructed without affecting the existing Viaduct traffic. (This traffic would have to be diverted elsewhere only during the brief period necessary to complete the north and south connections of the bypass structure.) Also, it would not be necessary to “cut-off” or physically isolate any of the waterfront facilities and businesses at any time during the project’s duration. The VISUAL IMPACT on Seattle’s waterfront district would be dramatic. An opportunity would thus exist for an excitingly new and different appearance and spatial construct. The total waterfront “experience” would be altered with additional, new structures, activities and uses. By applying skilled and creative designers and planners to the individual elements of the project, such as the bridge, inner harbor structures and land-based developments, the overall aesthetic character of Seattle’s “skyline” could be significantly improved. The project could thus become the central catalyst for a new, expanded image for the City, and begin the creation of a new “landmark” that might eventually rival the Space Needle. Similarly, the ECONOMIC IMPACT on Seattle would be tremendous. First and foremost, the visual and physical impediment that the Viaduct currently represents will be completely eliminated. The new bypass structure’s surface elements and the district’s recovered land areas could support new or expanded uses that are only partially feasible at this point – such as parks, playgrounds, mass transit facilities, parking garages, marinas, high-density housing, restaurants, specialty retail establishments, commercial buildings, a new cruise ship terminal..... one’s mind boggles with the possibilities! Such new activities and uses could be allowed to develop over time. Would they have a favorable impact on future city revenues? Would their spin-off effects generally benefit existing downtown businesses? You do the math; you be the judge. The ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT of this fifth alternative would be the least of all of the proposed alternatives. The bypass structure itself could be built elsewhere in sections that could be moved by water into place, similar to the way the two Lake Washington floating bridges were built. It would not be necessary to disturb the subsoil adjacent to the seawall, which the tunnel alternative would require, nor widen the existing surface streets. (Of course, the seawall would be repaired or replaced on an as-needed basis.) Because of the reduced time constraints, demolition of the Viaduct could be carried out in a manner that would have the least impact on the environment. The need to reroute existing vehicle and pedestrian traffic for long time periods would be minimized. The bypass structure’s impact on Elliot Bay’s marine life and its effects on currents and such

would have to be studied, but I do not foresee the significant endangerment of any animal or plant species, nor the altering of any existing natural structures. One potential use for the newly recovered waterfront land might be the development of a storm water treatment facility. (Currently, all of Seattle's storm water on the west

side of the CBD is dumped, untreated, directly into Elliot Bay.) The project could be expanded to address this additional opportunity to help improve Puget Sound's marine environment. In the selection of the "best" alternative, the following general criteria must be considered: a) money – i.e., the overall financial costs, savings and economic benefits to those entities that will have to pay for the project, b) time factors – i.e., the overall duration of the project, its impact on vehicular and pedestrian traffic, local business "down time," etc., c) environmental impacts, d) visual/aesthetic impacts, and e) the extent of public and private amenities gained or lost. With all of these things considered, the BEST ALTERNATIVE is the one I have just described. The four alternatives provided by the City of Seattle fall considerably short of this alternative's cost-benefit considerations. In more general terms, the selected alternative should provide a long-term, comprehensive strategy for the overall development of Seattle's waterfront district, present and future, in a manner that addresses ALL aspects of the current situation. In this regard, the four alternatives presented by the City of Seattle are sorely lacking. The problems and potential opportunities existing in the waterfront district extend far beyond the Viaduct and the seawall situations, upon which those four alternatives focus. They are safe (but dull and unimaginative) solutions that are undeserving of the time, money and efforts that need to be spent. The alternative I have just described was not my own idea originally. All such credit should be directed to Mr. Roger Patten, an architect and life-long resident of Seattle, currently living in Burien. It is my understanding that Roger was able to present his idea during the recent public exhibition of design solutions for the Viaduct/seawall project. At that exhibition he apparently displayed a scale model of the concept, along with other materials. I am, however, unfamiliar with what sort of response(s) he received. I am writing to voice my own support for Roger Patten's idea – i.e., the fifth alternative to the Viaduct/waterfront project – and to request Seattle's City Planning Department and other entities involved to give it serious consideration, equal to that already given to other four alternatives. Doing so could potentially save Seattle, its residents, the WSDOT, etc., a great deal of time, money and inconvenience, while jumpstarting a comprehensive development process that could totally transform Seattle's waterfront district in the near future. Not giving Roger Patten's idea its due consideration could be construed to be a serious abrogation of your department's fiduciary responsibility to review all reasonable urban planning concepts and ideas that might benefit the public's welfare. In this case, the potential losses to the public and private sectors of Seattle could be enormous. In closing, it is my understanding that this communication will be made part of the Public Record concerning this matter

230

Comment

I would like to offer a couple of thoughts: 1. Something must be done, and that something will cost a lot of money. However, since doing nothing is not an option, in future public discourse and statements on the topic, I believe you should start with the cheapest option, the Surface alternative (\$2.5-2.8B) as a zero point. That is, point out that we will be spending at least this much regardless, as failure to do so could result in catastrophic loss of life as well as disruption to the region's daily life. From a base of, at minimum, then, the topic becomes what we actually want - to get a tunnel, for example, adds only \$1.3-1.6B to that, which is much more palatable than the idea of spending \$4.1B. Essentially, look at the cheapest option (besides doing nothing) as sunk costs, and then envision what would actually be the best thing to have there, rather than looking at voluminous price tags and making a less desirable choice on this once-in-a-generation decision. 2. Tunnel. Aerial and surface do not add value to the downtown, but putting the whole thing underground would open up a vast track of amazing land. If done right, that could include development of beautiful, open public spaces, parks, private development in the form of housing and retail/service industry, and would see a massive net inflow of both local and tourist dollars. It could be consistent with the "Sustainable Seattle" image and mission, adding density as well as greenspaces to improve the overall quality of life in our fair city. 3. Inclusive process is essential for this process, but I think it is also important to keep in mind that in the end we must do the best thing for the city and all its inhabitants. While the viaduct currently offers breathtaking views of the Sound, and while property values of some buildings are currently dependent on those same views, a well-managed redevelopment of the entire waterfront could result in a great net public good, including more access to those views for all. As noted above, this is a once-in-a-generation chance; let's leave a legacy at which our grandchildren can look and speak of how visionary we were to realize the importance of providing open spaces and a livable, walkable community for all denizens of downtown, with the traffic hidden underground and not given pride of place on our gorgeous waterfront.

231

Comment

The Environmental Impact Statement is incomplete in that it wholly fails to make a statement about the environmental impact of the project. The Viaduct is the best traffic mover in the city. When it is shut down for inspections, the city freezes up. The EIS makes no mention of any alternative route which will handle the traffic during the years of construction. There are so many agenda motivating this project --- none related to efficient automobile traffic. Bike paths! How Seattle!

232

Comment

For less than \$1 Billion more than the only other viable alternatives (replace/Aerial), the tunnel will allow development, at last, of a special waterfront and the further beautification of a city that is already one of America's most scenic. I drive the viaduct everyday to work but would gladly give up my daily view for the integration of the waterfront to the city. Go for it, find the money, and don't be cheap about it. Including the other roadway improvements, this is clearly the path to take.

233

Comment

I have looked at the replacement plans you are presenting now for the viaduct replacement and I have a few comments for you.

It looks like the tunnel plans will drastically change the use and traffic patterns of the viaduct. The viaduct today is used by commuters from the southwest parts of Seattle to commute to and from downtown Seattle. ALL PARTS of downtown Seattle, not just the Pioneer Square and Stadium areas. With downtown exits planned only for the stadium area and King Street any traffic heading for commuting destinations north of King Street will be using numerous already overcrowded routes to arrive where intended. If the tunnel option is chosen there must be exits added for those traveling to the central and northern parts of downtown.

Many of the options seem to want to increase the traffic use of 99 for stadium events. Traffic is already very bad on the viaduct in the evening commute without adding the large number of cars for stadium events. The stadium exits should be removed and surface streets continue to be used for stadium traffic. Don't spoil a working system!

Please remember that the traffic using 99 must go somewhere during construction so don't just shut it down.

Thanks for your consideration

234

Comment

I would be very happy to see the tunnel alternative. We need to daylight the waterfront, return the above ground flow of traffic to pedestrian/bicycle/local auto access, and provide more greenspace for anyone coming to downtown to truly appreciate the waterfront. although the process will be somewhat painful for most commuters and ferry users, I do believe that in the long term Seattle will benefit in manifold ways. And the bonus will be that the noise levels will drop considerably too.

235

Comment

Please, please, please build the tunnel. I know this is one of the more expensive options, but we have a once-in-a-lifetime opportunity to reclaim some areas of waterfront if the tunnel is built. What a great legacy to leave to future generations of Seattleites.

236

Comment

I would have preferred if you had included a "no-rebuild" scenario in your list of alternatives. I would like to see the existing Viaduct taken down and I don't think that we need to spend billions on a replacement roadway. The waterfront land should be devoted to open space and mixed-use development, not a highway. I believe that our state and regional transportation funds would be better spent on fixing bottlenecks on I-5, reconfiguring surface streets, and most importantly, investing in regional rail corridors (light rail, monorail, BNSF). However, since this is not an option for the EIS, I support the Surface alternative. Four lanes would be preferable to six lanes, in my opinion. We need to stop focusing on road capacity and instead focus on transit and livability. Transit corridors and development density are the keys to Seattle's future success, not single-occupancy vehicles. Portland removed its waterfront freeway and it is now a far more livable city because of this decision. Seattle should follow their lead. Thank you.

237

Comment

I urge to you consider including the study of a No-Highway alternative in the EIS for this project. Replacing the viaduct with a huge project like tunneling will be incredibly time-consuming, expensive and disruptive to the waterfront. Currently, the viaduct cuts the city off from the waterfront and it's important to look at transportation alternatives that will not do the same thing in the future. I would like to see study of all alternatives in the viaduct project, which must include not replacing the viaduct at all. Then, a decision can be made that will be the most cost-effective and place priority on re-connecting our city to Elliot Bay.

238

Comment

We need a no-highway alternative! It is the cheapest and most visionary approach. We should spend our limited resources creating a people and nature-friendly waterfront and shaping a transportation system for the next century, not moving and parking cars right on our best real estate. We don't need a new dinosaur viaduct or an expensive tunnel on our precious waterfront! Thank you.

239

Comment

From the standpoint of a person in a car or truck, the full tunnel alternative is clearly the best (and the most expensive). From the standpoint of longterm ecology, limiting automotive exhaust in the city will greatly facilitate the quality of life for future generations. What are the serious rapid-transit and public transit components of this project? It would be great to make the waterfront a pedestrian friendly place accessible by effective transit options to parking areas away from the center of the city waterfront. Thanks for the careful and impressive work you have done so far in providing options for this enormous project. Dave Hall

240

Comment

I looked through the draft EIS and saw no details on how the new seawall would improve smolt passage in the Duwamish River estuary (Elliot Bay). The original seawall made no attempt to help smolt passage and consequently, some of the salmon affected by the seawall are endangered species. Any new seawall should bring smolt passage back to pre-seawall days so the salmon runs can return to normal over the life span of the new seawall. Fix the screw-up or let downtown crumble into the bay. If we cannot afford to make a salmon friendly seawall, we cannot afford to do the project.

241

Comment

Governor Gary Locke
District 34 Legislators - Poulsen - McDermott - Cody
Higher Education Coordinating Board
Seattle Mayor Greg Nickels

Sirs,
Yesterdays T.V. revealed a coalition to remove the Alaskan Way Viaduct - period. I reiterate San Francisco did not replace either the Embarcadero or the Oakland Mimitz two tier freeways.

After the Alaskan Way Viaduct is down how much money is saved by not rebuilding?

If voted on by the public we could very possibly have a four year college south of downtown - terminating some Northbound Collegiate traffic.

If enacted by the legislature we undoubtedly have another stadium.

Thank you for reading,

Ted Hansen

242

Comment

The DEIS must address a no-build alternative. We need to look at options that move traffic away from our waterfront. It is irresponsible to leave out this alternative.

Comment

Dear WashDOT and City of Seattle Members:

I am writing to share my concerns about the proposed drafts for rebuilding Seattle's city waterfront.

As a resident of downtown Seattle and as one of the many pedestrians that walks under the existing viaduct daily on my way to and from work, I have a vested interest in seeing Seattle's waterfront become a living city center. I share the waterfront vision of many others - a waterfront filled with pedestrian spaces and amenities that serve the broad demographic profile that constitutes Seattle's public community. In this vision I look forward to a time when all of the adjacent downtown neighborhoods feature useable connections to Seattle's waterfront, fostering and adding life to our new urban center. This waterfront vision considers our incredible natural surroundings, resources and precious habitats as crucial elements to Seattle's future appeal.

Our living waterfront vision cannot be realized, and cultural amenities that will truly serve the public of Seattle cannot be cultivated in a scenario where motorized traffic is the predominant feature of our waterfront, as suggested by ALL of the current EIS draft viaduct replacement options. The only thing that 8 lanes of motorized traffic along Alaskan Way can contribute to Seattle's waterfront is a congested and hazardous highway - completely devoid of pedestrian life (as is the void that currently defines the underside of Seattle's existing viaduct). The current draft suggestions do not allow for the thriving community growth, public pedestrian spaces, and the types of neighborhood businesses and amenities that will make our waterfront a destination and a joy to those that live, work and visit our beautiful city.

As a concerned resident of Seattle, I implore you to continue considering options for Seattle's waterfront that do not require so much of our valuable public waterfront space to be consumed by vehicle traffic. I encourage you to require that a strong connection be enforced from the waterfront to our other local treasures, such as Pike Place Market, Pioneer Square, and other waterfront neighborhoods, which can in part be accomplished through the extension of the proposed Highway 99 tunnel lid, and the public-space connections that such a solution provides.

I feel that it is only through endeavors like these that our precious resources can be preserved for future generations to enjoy, and that through our perseverance, time, and dedication our city can grow to become one of the most thriving and desirable cities in the US.

I thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,
Jessie R. Griess

244

Comment

Seattle has had many previous opportunities to improve itself in a major way via infrastructure projects. As a community, we have generally failed to take advantage of these opportunities. A few examples of Seattle failures: The City plan from 100 years ago. This would have given Seattle a true center and facilitated the movement of people and goods much better. Forward Thrust - Rail. We could have had the federal government pay for 90% of a comprehensive rail system. That system would have been built before urban density increased to the point it is currently at. This change in density adds significant costs to all infrastructure projects today. So instead of a less expensive system funded 90% by the rest of the country, we have an incredibly expensive system funded 90% by us. This represents a monumental failure by the community. Seattle Commons. We had an opportunity to create an amazing spine of open space available to all citizens. This was voted down because of fears that the industrial area would gentrify, and because citizens here have a history of being cheap and without vision (I am in the fifth generation of my family to live here so can say this from the "inside"). In the end, the neighborhood gentrifies anyway, and we have no park. Incredibly shortsighted by us. Bury I-5 through downtown. When I-5 was built, there was a marginal cost to bury significant portions of I-5 through downtown. This would have maintained connections between Capitol Hill and Downtown / South Lake Union. Did we go for it? No. Why, because this region has a history of not having vision. One more opportunity. We now have an opportunity to do something right with regards to infrastructure. Our pattern as a city and a region is to go down the shortsighted route of picking the cheapest option (some city examples - Kingdome, all of the municipal buildings, etc.). Why don't we do the right thing for once and CHOOSE THE TUNNEL OPTION? Anyone who has been to San Francisco, Boston, Vancouver, or just about anywhere in Europe can see the benefits of not having a freeway, especially an elevated one, cutting right through the urban fabric. This is our chance to reconnect the waterfront, to lower noise, to spur development, and to pick an option using more factors that "what is the cheapest option?" Another reason: The cost is almost the same for the tunnel option as the others, and yet we would get all the benefits. A Question of Revenues. Has anyone studied the estimated revenues to the City based on the different options? If the viaduct goes away and the automobile capacity is replaced under the surface, land values will immediately rise all along the central waterfront. This will raise tax collections. Why is this not factored into the DEIS? Furthermore, not only will choosing the tunnel option immediately raise revenues, but it will spur new development. This will create permanent and temporary jobs, new residences, offices, etc., increased tax revenues, more tourism, and many other benefits. The economic implications of the tunnel alternative make this choice not even close. It's time for Seattle to stop the pattern of poor planning choices, poor infrastructure investments, and shortsightedness. Let's embrace a new attitude of long-term vision, of making public investments that provide the highest returns, and of making this place better for all people. The choice is easy here. Pick the tunnel alternative.

245

Comment

Hi my name is Adrian and I have not read the Draft EIS, however I have read about the projects, the alternatives in the paper several times and I am a user of the viaduct and so my priorities are to be able to keep using it and also I think that if it's possible to build the tunnel not only financially but logistically while retaining the current viaduct then that would be my choice because I would love to see the waterfront less interrupted by not only the visual but the noise of the viaduct. So those are my choices and my priorities. Ok, thanks.

246

Comment

I am writing to voice my support for consideration of a "no viaduct" alternative in the Viaduct EIS. I believe that the City of Seattle and the region will be more vital and more successful if we do not build a new highway along Seattle's central waterfront. Improvements to arterial connections and transit would allow us to accommodate Viaduct freight and car traffic while easing congestion for us all, avoid a decade of disruption to businesses and residents, and avoid the billion dollar liabilities of a megaproject. Therefore, I urge you to work toward the inclusion of a "no-highway" alternative in the EIS."

247

Comment

I request that you do a full EIS of a NO HIGHWAY/NO TUNNEL alternative. The waterfront and the city need to be as interwoven, connected as possible. Tunnels we do not need and can not afford; highways and replacement viaducts are totally the wrong approaches to bringing as much value to Seattle as possible. Thank you.

248

Comment

Hello my name is Jeffrey Markwart and I live 915 16th Avenue Seattle WA 98122.

I would like the board to seriously consider the People's Waterfront Coalition that is written up in this week's Stranger edition. I think that just taking it down is the cheapest, most environmentally friendly, and public pedestrian friendly proposal that we've seen in Seattle for replacing the viaduct. I would seriously like them to consider the People's Waterfront Coalition as a viable and progressive solution to our problem. Thank you so much. You can contact me at 323-9055 with any questions.

249

Comment

Underground it! Underground is the only proper place for mass-transit facilities. Otherwise, they take up too much space and pollute the environment excessively, with visual, noise, and air and water pollutants.

250

Comment

I would prefer 1) Rebuild or 2)Aerial, even if the costs and time were the same. A few people would benefit from removal, but thousands use it, not just for transportation, but for the view -- use something besides a solid wall on each side: it's high on my list with out-of-town visitors. As for a "park", hang a pedestrian walkway half-way up on the water side with several access points. If additional parking could be worked in, this would be a big help in tourist season. Also, don't include Mercer St. or other non-essential areas in the initial plan: "too much, too vague", just like the proposal for the Commons a few years ago. We lived with "ramps to nowhere" for years, we can do it again.

251

Comment

I am only in favor of the tunnel alternative. Reasons: I grew up in Portland and am used to thoughtful, long-term city planning and the Portland waterfront. This is a great opportunity for Seattle to increase its livability and improve aesthetics and amenities for locals and visitors alike. The viaduct is an ugly eyesore, put it underground. Since I live in Burien and take the express bus to work in Seattle, I favor 3 lanes in both directions.

252

Comment

What are you doing. Our property values will plummet. Our noise level will increase, our views are history and much more dirt. Your alternative is NOT ACCEPTABLE. We're 67 years old; this project, literally will last the rest of our lives.

253

Comment

1231 5th Ave N #301
Seattle WA 98109-3368
April 20, 2004

Subject: Viaduct and Seawall Replacement Project

As requested, following are my comments on the Viaduct and Seawall Replacement Project.

1. I consider this to be the highest transportation priority for Seattle. I do use the viaduct nearly every day from my home on Queen Anne Hill to access Boeing health and fitness center in north Tukwila. Since the viaduct currently carries a significant portion of the traffic through Seattle, there is a continuing need for the capacity.
2. I fully support the underground tunnel approach and hope that it will facilitate both access to downtown and through traffic. My preference would include improved access to both Aurora and Elliott staying underground to avoid surface traffic as long as possible. Access to Seattle Center must be provided and integrated with the plan for Mercer Street improvements.
3. I also favor adding two HOV lanes. I consider this important and the only practical way to achieve increased capacity through the city. Although I support both light rail, the monorail and the need to build them out to maximum capacity, I believe that increased road capacity is also required to accommodate the population increase projected for 2050.

Sincerely,
John W. Southall

254

Comment

I can be reached at 206.448.6126. I have been trying to get a hold of Director Grace and I gave a message that I think might apply to you about the viaduct. I think it is worthwhile. We have to keep cars going from one point to another on the viaduct even though it's weak and cracked. What I am suggesting is putting steel strips layers along the highway each lane one two three across all the way end to end to fix it. Each lane one inch by ten feet, it should be no problem to lay the steel down. The topping would be cement for the cars to grip with the tires this way you have strength carrying across the load bearing by the length of each rectangle going right straight across. If there is problems with that just put a suspension above like the golden gate only a modern bridge for earthquakes and what not in the future. There will be a ramp going up made of steel and then topped off with cement is going up the slight rise with everything going fine. I think this a good idea, it is low cost its affordable and mind you apartment businesses hotels, restaurants, meetings and what not along each level covers up the huge bridge at each level. On the west and the east is a great opportunity for the City of Seattle, to join forces with the State and Federal to do something well down and cost affordable. Thank you.

I was cut off and I wanted to add a few things. This is crucial. My number you can call me 206.448.6126. I was talking to Grace, Director of Transportation, concerning the viaduct. Basically, as an addendum, please call Russ a billionaire many times over who was telling me about a research scientist that has ultra light, ultra strong steel in the works in his company. His number is 206.222.0141. This may be a huge cost savings and of course one inch thick by ten foot wide by so much long and mind you the University of Washington can cook this thing.

255

Comment

CASA Latina Day Worker Center will be adversely impacted by the viaduct reconstruction process. They need to move, I would like that DOT give priority to construction companies that included in their bids a commitment to working with CASA Latina to employ their workers in the construction. I like that the City of Seattle work with DOT to relocate to CASA Latina Day Workers Center to a suitable location. They have determined that near Home Depot in the SODO neighborhood would be an ideal relocation site.

256

Comment

We always took our visitors to the Seattle waterfront, but no more, as the noise level from viaduct traffic is often so high that the experience is utterly spoilt. I urge you not to replace the viaduct, and hope to see a waterfront rebuilding project that will bring some beauty to a wonderful city space.

257

Comment

The rebuild and the new aerial are the only feasible alternatives. Cost is a very important factor. And the solution has to be something that can carry traffic, both the amount now, and room to take more. While being able to withstand an earthquake.

258

Comment

1. Instead of tearing out the existing seawall, just add another 3' to 4' of bulkhead in front of it. We will end up with a stronger concrete structure and wider sidewalks. 2. Once the seawall is done. the Aerial Alternative could commence. 3. Build the Aerial Alternative wider and higher than the existing Viaduct. This means keeping the upper deck of the Viaduct as a working platform, while the new side structure of the Viaduct was being built. 4. The closest example I can think of would be McDonalds "arches" (they don't have to be "golden")that span the entire waterfront from the Bell Street tunnel to the Spokane Street Viaduct. 5. The arches could be higher and wider than the existing Viaduct, and the new "top" roadway (5 lanes or more headed North) would be above the existing Viaduct. 6. All traffic would be "two-way" on the existing South Bound lanes of the old Viaduct during construction. Believe me "one lane" of "express" traffic in both directions will be better than stop lights on surface streets. 7. Once the top lanes of the new structure are completed, traffic both ways (N-S) could be diverted onto this new wider roadway (something like they did when building the new First Avenue South bridge while repairing the old bridge). 8. The top lanes (North bound) of the old Viaduct could be dismantled and hauled away. The South bound lanes of the old Viaduct could be used as a work platform for the new South bound lanes of the "golden arches". 9. Once the new South bound lanes are completed, the remaining portion of the Viaduct could be easily dismantled underneath the arches and hauled away. 10. What is left under the "arch" design is more open space between the lanes, open space under the lanes, and greater distance between the "arches". The current "pillar" Viaduct looks like a concrete wall (think prison)and is very confining, but "arches" could be spaced farther apart BECAUSE...an arch is the strongest support structure we know of and has been around for Centuries. 11. Bottom line: Expand the seawall out into Elliott Bay (don't dig it up and replace it), and make the new Viaduct a series of large sweeping arches down the water front that people and cars can maneuver around and it won't feel so claustrophobic. 12. In closing, Tunnels are expensive, they trap and confine pollution, wrecks are more difficult to clear, people would require emergency exits from the tunnel, and the "landfill" proposals that I saw at the Bell Street Center a few weeks ago to add more "public park space" are ridiculous. There should be connecting "loops" between I-90, I-5, Spokane Street Freeway, and SR-99. Thank you for letting me suggest an "alternative" that goes beyond the current proposals.

259

Comment

It is not only prudent but necessary that a no-traffic option be studied. At a maximum, there should be a small access road along the water's edge or we will ruin an immense resource along our city's edge. Tunneling will be expensive, and will limit the flexibility of future development or restoration along the water's edge. We owe it to ourselves to explore locating the traffic elsewhere.

260

Comment

The only alternative I am opposed to is the surface alternative. The viaduct provides an essential function of a north-south transportation link, and any alternative that reduces its functionality would greatly exacerbate the existing traffic problems on I-5.

261

Comment

tunnel, tunnel and tunnel that is the best option for now and for the future, this is a once-in-a-lifetime chance to "do right" and i would hate to see a rebuilt viaduct or more surface traffic.... please tunnel regards Damien

262

Comment

Something does need to be done to help this wonderful old piece of Seattle's history. I favor the solution which least affects the current character of the viaduct and I believe there are suggestions on the board that do just that. However, I also believe that the people who have moved into that area are, and will be, a prevailing force in the destruction of the viaduct. They would like to have those million dollar views unobstructed and they can put money into the right pockets to see that decisions made are favorable to them. Poor planning, greed and shortsightedness have already gutted our beautiful city - it doesn't need to be that way but Seattle now seems to be populated predominately by people from other states/countries who couldn't care less about the character of the city.

263

Comment

I would like to see DOT seriously consider the option of not replacing the viaduct. I think that this option has many benefits, including lower cost and improving the waterfront appearance/aesthetics. I realize that this may seem radical, but other cities have done this with good effect. David Folweiler

264

Comment

I would like the DOT to add a "take down and do not replace" alternative to the EIS.

265

Comment

My husband and I live on Queen Anne, and we use the viaduct often. Please do not replace the viaduct with the all-surface boulevard—it would be a traffic nightmare!! The tunnel options are not only extremely expensive, they also eliminate access from Queen Anne and other neighborhoods north of downtown. If we lose our access to the viaduct, or if the convenient viaduct becomes a congested surface street, we will be forced onto I-5, increasing traffic there. I realize that many people think the tunnel options would look better, but we have to be realistic in the face of limited tax dollars. I do not believe that the extremely expensive tunnel is the highest and best use of our tax money. Please either rebuild the viaduct, or build the new aerial. That will preserve the access and service that neighborhoods like Queen Anne have now, and will cost much less than the tunnel options. Thank you for considering my comments.

266

Comment

None of these alternatives are satisfactory. The viaduct should be torn down and traffic redirected away from the waterfront. The seawall should be extended to the west. The waterfront should be more authentic with less tourist glitz. A tunnel along the waterfront is an extremely attractive target for terrorists and seems very dangerous for transporting any flammable cargo.

267

Comment

I am 100% in favor of the Rebuild option. It will handle the highest volume of traffic in the shortest time period, it is least costly, has the least disruption, provides the most parking for those visiting or using the ferries, & provides a beautiful view of the waterfront to those of us who cannot afford to live on the water. I have driven the viaduct daily for the last 32 years & it is one of the special treats that a driver has in downtown Seattle. I enjoy the views (of small boats, large ships, Mt. Rainier, the Olympic mountains, stadiums, buildings, concerts, sunsets, para-sails, the list is endless) the action, & the aromas from the waterfront restaurants. I don't know how many times I've seen something that prompted me to follow up with a visit to the waterfront to participate in shopping, dining or activities. If I were limited to travel through a tunnel my visits to the waterfront & downtown would decrease considerably (out of sight, out of mind!). We cannot afford a reduction in capacity since it is virtually impossible to increase the capacity of I-5 the other major alternative to N-S traffic through Seattle. My second choice would be the Aerial Alternative. However I do not understand why it would be proposed that the volume of traffic would be intentionally reduced on SR99 & that parking would be eliminated without increasing the capacity on Alaskan Way. I absolutely am opposed to any of the tunnel alternatives. They are too costly, take too long to build, have less capacity, & I do not want to be traveling below the level of Puget Sound in the event of an earthquake. I find the cost & volume projections to be very suspect & get the distinct impression that they were backed into in an attempt to get initial support when the reality is that they are considerably higher. I definitely do not believe that increasing the number of lanes on the surface streets from 4 to 6 on Alaskan Way will allow an increase in the traffic volume from 10,000 to almost 50,000, especially if as you project there will be more people walking across Alaskan Way to get between the waterfront & downtown. I also find the projection on the tunnel alternative that shows that Alaskan Way volume can be increased from 10,000 to 21,000 without an increase in number of lanes to be extremely dubious. The surface street option is too ludicrous to even consider. There is no way that 6 lanes of traffic will be able to move 74,000 vehicles a day & the travel time will be considerably higher than those projections. Talk about a barrier to pedestrians & a bottleneck for through traffic. The area population cannot afford another costly bill when we cannot handle the costs that we have now. Politicians need to be accountable & limit costs the way that the public must. How much money does the city stand to lose by eliminating the revenue from the parking under the viaduct? I don't see this included with any of the cost projections. Those with the most to gain are the downtown property owners whose views are blocked by the viaduct & stand to benefit at the cost of everyone else. No one I've spoken with has expressed their feeling that this is any more of an eyesore or barrier to the waterfront than the existing railway line that runs along the waterfront & disrupts traffic flow. We cannot decrease the volume of daily traffic moved quickly through the city & all options except the rebuild do exactly that. I firmly believe that selection of an alternative for this issue is too important to be left to agencies that have apparent biases. Ultimate decision making should be with the voters & I will oppose any attempt to railroad the voters. The Port of Seattle is notorious for deciding based upon their own agenda & making up their minds before accepting any citizen input.

268

Comment

- 1) I support the 6 lane tunnel.
- 2) I oppose the temporary flyover bypass that would direct traffic along Alaskan Way.
- 3) If in fact a flyover is built then a guaranteed time be stipulated for it to be torn down.
- 4) Residents need to be compensated for the adverse impact the project will have on property values and residents need to see a schedule of compensation over the next 9-15 years. That is calculated with a guarantee during the construction period as some may have to sell their homes or may not live there the duration of construction.

269

Comment

I think it's wrong to include unthoughtout improvements north of the Battery Street Tunnel in this process. We need to cut this down so we can afford to get it going. Mercer/Thomas St improvements belong in the South Lake Union plan.

270

Comment

I like the Tunnel alternative the best. I'd like our waterfront area to look nice.

271

Comment

Coming from the South end - I think I am attracted to both the Aerial and Tunnel options. Most of this comes from an interest in keeping capacity higher and travel times lower. I personally would like to keep the lovely view that all of us enjoy from the viaduct now - but can also appreciate the sense of space and openness that the tunnel would create on the surface.

272

Comment

I don't see why the Seawall is part of this package - it seems to make it more expensive. The tunnel addresses only a short part of the seawall and that has to be the most expensive way to do it. Can't we (as Seattle) do our own seawall!

273

Comment

Considering safety, aesthetic quality, traffic, commerce, and environmental impact the tunnel appears to be the best alternative. Although more expensive I believe the City and State will have more benefit well into the next century with this alternative.

274

Comment

My name is Erin Howshar. I am a resident on Alaskan Way, and I've lived there for approximately four years.

I'm concerned about the Draft Environmental Impact Study because I don't feel that it adequately addresses a lot of issues that should be addressed for Downtown residents. One, I don't feel it adequately addresses the alternatives in a comprehensive manner. It only addresses five alternatives, and does not address at all, routing traffic other ways through the city and through the downtown area. It does not focus on minimizing impact to Downtown residents, and especially along the waterfront. I don't feel that it adequately addresses the economic impact that is going to be had to Downtown residents and business owners along the waterfront, especially with regard to the plan to build a temporary viaduct along Alaskan Way and in front of many of the businesses and residences that are downtown.

I don't feel that the Environmental Impact Study adequately addresses how to compensate for disruption of residential privacy, and I don't feel that the Environmental Impact Study adequately addresses improving the current infrastructure through the downtown area.

I was also disappointed that the hearing today was not a public hearing, that residents did not get a chance to hear what everyone else was saying, and to be heard by their fellow Downtown residents.

I also don't think the Environmental Impact Study adequately addressed public safety, during the construction project and after. Thank you.

275

Comment

I just wanted to say that this is probably the biggest project that this city has undertaken in decades, and the City's only got one chance to really make it right. And I think that, in my opinion, as someone who lives on the waterfront, I'd like to see the waterfront and the downtown area reconnected, with lots of open, green space. And I think in order to accomplish that the best alternative is the tunnel. It doesn't seem to me that in terms of time and inconvenience, if it takes, you know, one year or six months, here or there, it doesn't seem to make a lot of difference, and I'd like the City to really think very carefully about what impact this is going to have to all of us that live in the waterfront area and play in the waterfront area, and spend your dollars wisely. That's it.

As far as the impact on the quality of life for the people who live on the waterfront, we're going to be decimated in terms of our quality of life if you decide to build the fly-over, when you do the aerial, you know, replacement of the aerial proposal, I suppose. We'll be affected by the construction of the fly-over, we'll be affected by the noise that's generated by all the cars that are whizzing by in front of our windows, essentially, and we'll be affected adversely by all of the pollution that's going to be produced by all of the cars whizzing by our windows, and I just don't think that that's a very viable idea.

One of the things that I'd like to see is you just knock the darned thing down and do an experiment for a year and see how people maneuver and how they get into the city, and see if doing nothing is actually a good alternative. If the City steps up and they build Park and Ride, and they help people with alternatives, and encourage them to leave their cars at home, better yet for all of us.

So, there's a lot for you all to consider, and in the end, I'd like to see a tunnel get built down on the waterfront. Thank you.

276

Comment

The tunnel is the best solution for all the other are too impact full on residence, tourism, the air quality for pedestrians. We need to look at long term for our city a tunnel is the best solution.

Do not believe the EIS has considered impact on local residence with fly by alternative.

However feel the Tunnel alternative is the most beneficial for our environment.

277

Comment

I am very concerned about the placement of the Pike Street ventilation shaft. I live in Hill Climb Court (518) and see that the shaft's placement have serious effects to our building along with Ross Manor and Market Court, not to mention Pike Place Market.

I would very much like to see the 'no-highway' option, recently advocated, to be included in the Final EIS. This seems to be the lowest impact on the environment and, perhaps, the cheapest solution. Please include the 'no-highway' option in the Final EIS. Thanks.

278

Comment

Well, I just wanted to say that I am opposed to the fly-by alternative they have for traffic flow. It seems like just a waste of taxpayer dollars.

I am definitely for a tunnel to go through, but there should be a different way, an alternate route for traffic. I've wondered why we couldn't make Alaskan Way one way south, and maybe Third Avenue or another route, one way north and one south, and then connect in together. It seems like a common-sense way to do it.

I think the viaduct is unsafe and an alternative needs to be taken care of sooner, rather than later.

Well, I think environmentally the fly-by situation is not good for tourism, for anything on the waterfront. When I go down there I like to -- it's noisy enough as it is, and then that would just impact it even more.

I can't think of anything else I want to say. I think that just says it in a nutshell.

279

Comment

It is my opinion that rebuilding would serve us as the best choice.

280

Comment

Overall great job on an amazing amount of work accomplished. My personal preference is the tunnel alternative, possibly due to my feeling for connecting the city to the waterfront and the possibility of separating pedestrian and vehicular transportation. The reasons for the tunnel over the bypass would be the added 'habitat' value of the tunnel by rebuilding the seawall.

*Couldn't really grasp the habitat value. Based on a special measure? What about quality and diversity in habitat?

Comment

Well, my name is Mas Koba, spelled M-a-s, and then the last name, K-o-b-a. And as far as my residential address, 1726 - 15th Avenue, and that's Seattle, 98122, in Seattle.

And as far as this viaduct and this seawall they're constructing, that's costing something about \$2-and-a-half-billion dollars to, I'd say, over about almost \$1-billion dollars, it seems like it's a lot of money there, but I'd say one of the things that they or they probably could think about is to try to extend the viaduct going north, all the way to the Interbay, and then over to North Magnolia, along the canal there, and then into Discovery Park, and then from there, from West Point, be able to connect, have a cross Sound connection over to Bainbridge Island, and over to the peninsula. And then, you can charge toll on the thing.

And then the other route would be going south, going on the existing road there, going over to West Seattle, and possibly if they want to go all the way down to Fauntleroy, be able to go from the Fauntleroy Ferry and to go across, have a cross Sound connection over to Vashon Islands, and then over to the peninsula. Or, if they don't want to go down to Fauntleroy, the other way would be go over to West Point, or I should Alki Point, and have a cross Sound bridge strating from there over to the Vashon, and then over to the peninsula.

And I'd say this should be there because, well, one thing is to replace that ferry system that the State is running, because that ferry system is a money loser. The people of the state are subsidizing that thing, and I think that it's about time. This is the 21st century age, and we can't do something there that's -- or start way back in the 19th century and using 19th century ideas, but go into the 21st century age. That's something we can be able to think about.

We can make this a toll, the whole thing, starting from the Vashon Islands and going into Seattle downtown area, over to West Point and over, and make that entire route a toll road. And I'd say a toll road and a toll bridge, because I think a toll system will work a lot better, if they were all connected, all the bridges and the Alaskan Way Viaduct.

And from the past history, this is something that's not new, it's been started with this idea that was thought about way back in, I'd say, the early 40's, and they were planning to do something like this, you know. The idea about having a cross Sound bridge, the idea was favored by even one of the governors who was a Republican governor, by the name of Arthur Langly. But, he was all in favor of doing something like this, because at that time the ferry system was privately owned and they were trying to build the money or, I should say -- yeah, they were trying to vote the people out of raising the fair every damned time, and it was getting very expensive for people to be paying this amount of money, so the State went and stepped in and they said -- and they were trying to control it, as far as the pay increase on the toll, I should say on the -- you know, yeah, they were trying to increase the fair on the ferry. But, so, when the State came out with this idea, well, we're going to put in a bridge and that would just -- and they told them, "Well, you guys are not going to be in business after we put the bridge in," which was sort of a black mailing somewhat. And so they said, "Well, the thing you can do is just sell the ferry system to us, and then we'll build this bridge, and then the ferries, we won't have to use of the ferries no more."

Well, the thing is, the State went and bought out the ferry system, but they never ever built the dog gone bridges, so for the last 50 years it's been sort of a concept and an idea that many people like myself still do remember that. And I say now is the time that we should start thinking about doing something like this, rather than having a ferry system which is doing nothing but just costing us money every damned time that we have our eyes on the damned thing. That just doesn't seem to make any sense, to go out and subsidize it. So, if they say, "Well, as far as how much it would cost to put up a system like this," well, who knows? It may cost maybe about \$100-billion. Well, you know, when they built the first Lake Washington bridge, they said that the cost would be over \$10-millions or something. And people were saying were squabbling back then, they were squawking the darned thing was expensive, it would never ever work, you know, and they were trying to fight it from going on. But I think they were fighting for something like about 5 years or 10 years, or whatever it was, but they finally went and built that thing, and after they built that thing, that thing made money. They were expecting the thing would be paid for within about 20 years. They've had that thing paid off in about 5 years.

And, when they put in the Tacoma Narrows Bridge, the first one, when it went down, it was about the same time that they opened up the lake Washington Bridge, the first one. Well, when they built the second one there, which is back in 1950, they built it more sturdier, and it cost about twice as much as the first one that they built up, and that thing got paid off in something like 14 years or so. And the same thing happened to the Evergreen Bridge. That was on -- they were all paid off by tolls. Whoever uses that thing, you know, it was -- it's a -- you know, users pay. That works. So it didn't cost anybody anything else, except the dog gone people who were using the thing. So, it makes sense to do something like that.

If they can, you know, build the cross Sound bridge, the two cross Sound bridges, and then have this, you know, Alaskan Way Viaduct included with it, and make that entire route a toll road or toll bridge. But, I think just, you know, if either one of them would just had stand alone on the thing, I don't think it would work because, you know, you got to have a connection of some kind in order for these, you know, the three places to -- two cross Sound bridge, and that connecting of Alaskan Way Viaduct.

282

Comment

No above ground alternative is worth the effort.

*Yes to seawall/tunnel combo project.

I like the removal of crumbling viaduct.

*Support all tunnel - cut and cover - seawall repair and replacement.

283

Comment

Would prefer to see the viaduct dismantled and thru traffic routed to I-5. Bus traffic to downtown should be using the bus lanes paralleling 4th Ave S. Alaskan Weay should not carry more traffic, but made into a wide boulevard with wide pedestrian-friendly access and many crossing points to access waterfront and street car and ferry terminal.

284

Comment

I live on the waterfront. I would like to see the city and WSDOT build a project that opens the waterfront so I like the Tunnel alternative. I am concerned that is the Aerial alternative is built the flyover will destroy our quality of life with the initial construction of the flyover then with the noise of the traffic and pollution from the cars. This is your chance to get one of the most important project in decades right...Build the Tunnel.

285

Comment

Mr. Ray,

As a 3rd generation native and daughter of a King County Engineer (of the past) I would vote whole heartedly to repair the viaduct!

The "down to earth" pathways are always so congested it takes the pleasure out of driving thru Seattle. We have a lovely city but the I-5 or 99 "parking lots" create more road rage and confusion.

The viaduct is a pleasure to drive. The view is breathtaking but tranquil if traffic does get backed up during rush hours.

I live at Northgate and can watch I-5 back up most of the day or night, so know to take the viaduct to South 99 or to West Seattle or even better, it is a simple, fast route to SeaTac.

For heaven sake, please use good judgment and not replace or tear it down to pacify developers who want to ruin the waterfront for their own profit.

Sincerely,
Phyllis Jewell
10345 Meridian N. #704
Seattle, We 98133-9459
206.517.3454

Comment

Alaskan Way Viaduct Draft EIS Response

Dear Ladies and Gentlemen,

In 1982, a small committee, of which I was a member, called the Waterfront Action Committee proposed removing the viaduct. This committee later became the public/private Seattle Waterfront BIA of which I chaired after Mr. Chuck Peterson. In this committee we researched the removal of the viaduct and the building of a tunnel under Alaskan Way. We decided to use Boston as a case study since they were at the time designing and building a tunnel similar to what we were proposing.

I went to Boston in the 80's to see the impact and the project of their underground waterfront tunnel. We concluded that a tunnel on the Seattle waterfront would cost billions and that a surface alternative was more reasonable and affordable solution.

The viaduct is a safety hazard and not only a safety hazard from the standpoint of earthquakes. Tires from the upper level of the viaduct fly off all the time down onto the pedestrians below. You won't believe how these tires bounce any which way upon hitting the ground below. All sorts of items fly off the viaduct, including rocks, down onto the pedestrians below. I have observed a car straddled on the upper edge of the rail of the viaduct after a car accident. I fully expect a car to fly off the viaduct someday down onto the people below. On occasion windows of the adjacent buildings are shot at with 22shots and bee-bee gunshots.

The proposed "Rebuild and Aerial Alternative" does not eliminate the dangers of earthquake for this type of structure. The proposed structure has a fault. This area is fill land and beach.

The proposed structures in these alternatives only have pilings down to the top of the competent solid. This is insufficient for this area. Life safety structures in this area need structural piling all the way down to hard bedrock something these two proposals do not include. It has always been the case for the fill and beach area that in order to prevent sinking you need to build to bedrock for major structures. I am convinced that over time these kinds of viaduct structures which are being proposed do have a real risk of pan caking during major earthquakes and as they age. The structural load and strain is transferred horizontally creating the greatest strain at the column joint rather than the immediate load going directly to a vertical column as in the structure of most freeways today.

In San Francisco and Oakland these types of structure have failed at radical rates of destruction.

In other words you could spend all this money on a new viaduct and have it sink during the first major earthquake. In the long term, a new viaduct just creates the same structural problem we have today, which potentially can endanger the lives of many people in the future and cost the City of Seattle billions of dollars. I don't care which structural engineer suggests differently this area is earthquake prone, this area lies on fill and the proposed new viaduct structure is an inferior structure, which does not stand up to the test of time.

Today's viaduct is an eyesore for our beautiful City. It is also a physical barrier from the waterfront to the city. When they built the existing viaduct, Alaskan Way was an industrial area with many railroads underneath it. That is not the case today. The railroad is gone, the uses have changed, the safety of the people is a concern and the potential to beautify our city is enormous.

I strongly object to the proposed alternative's as stated in the draft EIS for "Rebuild and Aerial Alternatives" and I advise the committee not to select either of these proposals.

One very important item that is missing from all of the proposals is a path for light rail or monorail, rapid transit and/or a path for a subway. Without pointing fingers, it is easy to state that the lesser Seattle or Washington groups have hindered the development of a complete transit system that includes a rail system. Don't build it, they won't come mentality was completely wrong. First, they came anyway, and now our future growth problems will be internal from the people born here in the state.

This project area is a prime area for a direct route from Seattle to the Airport with rapid transit and it should not be forgotten at this time. A future development path needs to be included in the surface and the building of a subway needs to be included in the proposed tunnels with small stations located in key areas of the Seattle Waterfront and the ability to connect to a major transit network.

The surface alternative is an affordable and reasonable solution for the Seattle Waterfront. After the San Francisco earthquake which destroyed the use of their viaduct, I watched closely to the before and after of that area. That area turned out great for San Francisco and they didn't have the nightmares that Boston had with its waterfront tunnel.

Surface Alternative:

The area East of the existing right of way line. This 14' - 16' depending on existing building location is proposed to be a sidewalk. This area is not owned by a government

agency, it is fee simple land. It has much higher and greater use than a sidewalk. One can build up to 16 stories on this proposed sidewalk under current zoning. It is also the area that existing building can remodel in order to change the building's existing current exteriors and use in that area. This will allow for complete renovation and a new look for each property on the waterfront. This area should not be included in this viaduct project. It should be left for the owners and City of Seattle to determine

what is best for that section of commercial land at a future date.

The proposed sidewalk next to the city buildings should commence immediately west of the "existing right of way line." In looking at the design there are at least two areas of luxury. Two bike paths of 6' are not needed. One bike path of 8' would be sufficient to handle the working and sporting needs of the people. The area just east of the streetcar, a total of 13', will be under utilized or not used at all. A 6' foot side is all that is needed here, if at all.

Bypass Tunnel and Tunnel Alternative

Both proposals should include paths for a subway. The Tunnel alternative is a great alternative, but the structural support pilings need to go down to bedrock. This proposal is a matter of cost and durational impact on the city. Boston's waterfront tunnel turned out to be a nightmare. So everyone needs to be on board and support the project. Mitigation damages for the neighboring area and businesses also needs to be addressed.

When the bus tunnel was built all of the retail businesses on 3rd Avenue went out of business. We have several home furnishing businesses on Western Avenue who will be impacted and the over the water pier businesses may or may not survive such a project.

The Port of Seattle may also be impacted by such a project, so construction phasing needs to be applied in order to create the least amount of impact. Sectional construction may be a solution to minimize the impact. Projects always cost more than expected so whatever number you think it will be, add 15% - 30% more and you will have the real number for this project. Government projects always seems to take longer than planned also so add a couple of years to the timeline from commencement.

The viaduct is the State of Washington's Highway 99. The Dept. of Transportation in the 60's, 70's, and 80's did not plan or build (when things were cheap) for growth in the State of Washington.

When the removal of the existing Highway 99 Viaduct occurs it is the responsibility of the State of Washington to replace their old highway with a new modern highway that fits the needs of the future and the surrounding areas. To refuse to plan for decades of growth in the State of Washington and to now tell the taxpayers of Seattle they have to pay for it is unacceptable. This is a state project. Perhaps surface roads can be viewed as city projects yet that only means that the state plans to ignore its responsibility in tearing down and replacing Highway 99 with a better design for modern and future times by providing for future transportation needs.

If the City of Seattle is forced to fund a significant part of this viaduct project, then I would ask that the Surface Alternative be selected.

Sincerely,

Hugh H Hot son Jr.
General Partner
Maritime Associates
911 Western Avenue, Suite 500
Seattle, Washington 98104

287

Comment

I live on Alaskan Way, so I'm extremely interested in the length of time that the construction will go on, and the amount of disruption that will take place, which is understandable, it's going to have to happen. But I would have liked to have seen in the Environmental Impact Statement a discussion about what could be done to shorten the lengths of construction period.

Also, I would like to see a discussion about the cost of the fly-over bridge and whether or not, since there's no money for the whole project, whether that is something that should be put aside and not waste the money building a temporary fly-over bridge.

That's the main thing. Neither of those is discussed in the Environmental Impact Statement. So, that what I'd like to see happen.

288

Comment

Okay. I live at 1950 Alaskan Way, down on the waterfront. And while there's a lot of things about this that I support, I have a lot of problems. I have problems with something specific, and it has to do with the picture that's on Page 143 of the Draft EIS. It's a picture of a temporary bypass viaduct, if you will, fly-over, from the Battery Street tunnel to Alaskan Way. And it will go right in front of where I live, and I will be looking at traffic going by at 50 miles an hour, 20 feet from my terrace. Which, you know, I guess if we have to handle it, we have to handle it. I have some concerns with this.

This is supposed to be temporary. If the project doesn't raise all the money it expects to get, and it gets partly into the project, this temporary viaduct could be there a very long time. So, I'm concerned that they will start the project without enough money, and leave this thing up.

Another thing that bothers me is to build this temporary fly-over, it's going to cost hundreds of millions of dollars and add years to the project. And I'm not sure that the rest of the state is going to appreciate spending that kind of money to keep traffic flowing during this construction period. This money could go to the 520 bridge, it could go to east side projects. They're not going to be very happy about that. What we should be trying to do is get this project done and over as soon as possible. Hundreds of millions of dollars is not available, to start with.

The issue I have is it looks to me like this project is taken as a given that they have to keep traffic flowing while the project's going on. They haven't particularly studies alternative ways of keeping traffic flowing. And so, it seems to me it's almost like a given, and a prerequisite, and I don't accept that given, and I don't accept that prerequisite. There are other alternatives that ought to be evaluated.

People in West Seattle are going to have a problem when the viaduct is under construction. Ferry services to West Seattle is an alternative. There are things that can be done to significantly improve traffic flow during all of this, and I don't think that has been studied.

The way this project is going it looks like the waterfront is going to take the entire hit. And while we're willing to take a hit, we think that it needs to be shared, and that there are ways to get traffic flowing for the City, and spending hundreds of millions of dollars adding years to the project is just going to increase the pain, and it hasn't been justified.

And the major comment here is that the Draft EIS does not adequately cover this subject. It's almost as if it was a prerequisite that they have to keep this traffic flowing, and they haven't looked at alternatives to keep it flowing. All they've looked at is an alternative that adds years and lots of money to the project. Adding those years, spending that money, I don't see in the Draft EIS the justification for doing that, and I think that's a big whole in the Draft EIS.

289

Comment

What I do want in the record is that I'm a resident of Downtown Seattle, living on Alaskan Way, so Alaskan Way is my home.

First, I object to the format of the hearing. I thought it would be a public hearing, where we would hear the comments of other folks, and I request that the State provide some type of public format where we can all hear the comments of others hearings or other concerned individuals.

Regarding the Draft EIS, as a resident who lives on Alaskan Way, I'm concerned that the document does not adequately discuss the impact to my home on Alaskan Way, given the increased possibility of increased traffic, and does not adequately address the concerns of the increase of pollution from the vehicles traveling through there, as well as the sound and noise pollution from the additional vehicles.

I'm also concerned that the inadequacies of this Draft EIS, as a public document, does not provide a strong foundation upon which the public can comment on the potential options for the viaduct. That's all.

290

Comment

I'm Bill Mackay. This, I think, is a reasonably easy decision, in that there's great precedence for making this decision. The hard things to are ones where there is not precedence and you have to look at confusing facts and decide, "How are we going to do this decision?"

In this case, though, about 25 years ago, in the City of San Francisco, they had two freeways the same vintage as these, almost exactly analogous, and they had a large earthquake. On the Oakland Bay side it was the Admiral Nimitz freeway and, more pertinently, in San Francisco there was the Embarcadero Freeway. Major arterial flows.

The Oakland Bay Bridge funneled eight lanes of traffic over the tip of it, and dropped it into the Embarcaderos freeway and the interstate coming from the south into San Francisco, and both of those funneled into the Embarcadero freeway, which was the only way to get around the city to the Golden Gate Bridge.

The earthquake wound up having the Embarcadero freeway having to come down. Parts of it was fallen, and the other part of it had to be removed. And there was, like today, there was, "We can't live without it." "There's too many cars that go across it." We'll never survive if we don't have something like it." There was a lot of gnashing of teeth with politicians, but a lot of the populous did not like the freeway, because it blocked their view. Sounds familiar? And it had been build at a time when there were huge warehouses down there and there wasn't anything, and it was a very bad part of the city, still.

The decision, finally, either due to it was easy or because they listened to the people, was that they decided not to replace it entirely. It's never been replaced. And everybody survived. All of the traffic still gets through from both of those. They go through the middle of downtown. Is it easy to do? No, and not terribly convenient, but they do get through there. All the people who want to get from "A" to "B" do. The area flourished in that it became, for walking, what used to be underneath the freeway is now a great walking boulevard, a great greenery, and people love the area now. There's all sorts of very high rent condominium and other restaurants and establishments in the area. The politicians are viewed as absolute heroes now, those who made the decision to not replace it.

My point is, that that's as good of an analogy as you'll ever see to the situation we face now. If you don't succumb to the pressure of saying, "We have to do something," "We don't have any money, so we'll do something cheap and easy," even if you do nothing, all those who say we can't possibly survive are wrong, you will survive. The ideal thing that you have to do, because you only get a chance like this every 70, 80 years or so, in order to do something monumental, is get that out of there as a view block.

If you really believe in tourism, and you really think this has got to be a great city, and it is, but that's one aspect of it that is an anachronism left from the past. Bring it down, do not replace it, put the freeway underground, that which you need, and turn that into a boulevard, much like San Francisco had. If you do, the politicians who make the decisions, you will also be viewed as great saints and heroes. If you build another one, that will be your legacy, and people will hate you for years.

291

Comment

My name is Janice Blair, and I live on the waterfront on Alaskan Way. And I'm concerned that the EIS didn't address the traffic during the interim, especially during cruise season. Right now, during cruise season, the streets are clogged already, and I don't think that they have figured out or have thought about how they're going to keep those trucks moving as they come to supply the cruise ships.

Also, I didn't see how they're going to work with the noise and the dust. I'm thinking about not only the residents on the waterfront, but tourists and other people from that area that want to come and enjoy the waterfront, and what that would do to the businesses, with all of the dust and noise at that time. Having people on the waterfront is what keeps it vital.

And there's the public safety issues as well. With more people down there, things are safer, and I'm afraid that they haven't really covered those issues.

Comment

I am Bonnie Collett, and I reside at 1425 Western Avenue, in Seattle. Our collective concerns in our condo unit, or our condo group, is that the EIS needs to establish a forum for residences and businesses adjacent to the project site who work with the design team to assure that concerns about construction impacts are met, develop a clear process by which claims for any damage to adjacent properties can be met and fully compensated. The full disclosure of project insurance levels or self-insurance of WSDOT should be made.

Locate the Pike Street ventilation buildings and its stacks some place other than Pike Place Market hill climb. There's a lot of children who play in the daycare there, there's tons of tourists that come by, and it's not a good idea.

The EIS needs to address the release of concentrated pollutants and their affect on residential property directly adjacent to proposed ventilation stacks. What are the affects of the constant exposure to the fumes from the ventilation building? What type of particulate matter will be released, and what are the health risks?

The EIS should also address the change in character of the ambient noise resulting from the frequency and steady sound of the fans. These concerns should affect a location for the building to a non-residential area. We ask that you limit construction noise that exceeds the City of Seattle Residential Nighttime Noise Regulation to nonresidential areas of the project site. Appendix F states that City noise levels are expected to be exceeded in the nighttime, and this is not acceptable in a residential area.

Phase the construction adjacent to Hill Time Court to maintain parking garage access onto Alaskan Way, integrate safe access into the final design, provide adequate dust control during demolition, and develop programs to keep the area businesses alive during the project period. Having people continue to access the area shops and restaurant will enhance the safety of the adjacent neighborhoods. Thank you.

Comment

My name is Robert Nokes. I am a homeowner in the Alaskan Way neighborhood, and you don't need my address. I have read the EIS Statement and I think there are some deficiencies in the Statement that need to be talked about.

But before I go into that, I would like to, for the record, say that I think this kind of a forum is not an appropriate way in which to hear all of the public's comments with respect to the EIS. I think the State Department of Transportation should reconsider having more public meeting and having true public testimony, because I think the fair bid can be gained by people speaking in public and feeding on each others ideas, and flushing out the full issues that are in front of the DOT. I see this kind of a process, the open house process, as a way to kind of divide and conquer the neighborhood, by isolating people and having them only out their information directly to either a court reporter or through a computer process. It denies everyone that possibility of hearing others' opinions and having actual hearing examiners, with some authority, who actually listen to those opinions and help develop their opinions with respect to EIS Statement.

As to the DOT EIS Statement itself, I think there are some deficiencies. I've been a resident of the Alaskan Way neighborhood for a number of years, and I can say it's a vital neighborhood. I think, not only do we have a large residential population on Alaskan Way, we have also benefited from a great deal of money and effort by the Port of Seattle to develop Pier 66. There has been a lot of private money in the development of the Marriott and other properties along the waterfront, and it is a very vital neighborhood. It is, in many respects, a gateway to Seattle for many, many travelers that come to see our city.

I would say that most visitors to Seattle remember two or three things about their visit. One is the waterfront, Pike Place Market of course falls under that, as well as the Space Needle, maybe even the Ballard Locks from time to time. But my concern is if the EIS Statement doesn't carefully consider the true costs of trying to build this project while never interfering with traffic flow, as it is currently defined, that we may drive away a whole generation of potential visitors to Seattle.

I'm thinking, in particular, about the additional expense of the throughway that they're calling a temporary bridge, while the route traffic during construction of this project. First of all the EIS Statement does not talk about what is the true cost of that, how much extra time will it take to build that and tear it down and, as a result, how much extra money is it truly going to cost Seattle to continue routing traffic during one construction phase.

My concern is if this DOT doesn't carefully consider the alternatives, i.e. not continuing to route all traffic during this period, and allowing a reconsideration of routing traffic through other venues in Downtown Seattle, or the I-5 corridor, without careful consideration of that, we may be expending so much money for a very temporary result, that no one truly even is able to identify. Not only is there a cost of building and tearing down, there is cost of potentially destroying this neighborhood, driving away tourist traffic, destroying most of the businesses on the waterfront, perhaps even driving away cruise ship traffic to Seattle. All of those indirect expenses to Seattle, I think, can add up to be a very, very large number.

If a construction period is for four to five years, it's conceivable to get through that process and still have a vibrant waterfront area for visitors. My concern is if a construction period lasts 10 years, it may well teach an entire generation of people that Seattle is nothing more than a construction zone, and destroy the vitality of the downtown.

In addition to those costs there are the potential destruction of property values and, therefore, the tax revenues that will be generated for the values of the properties on the waterfront. So, I think this has a potential negative impact, if it isn't carefully thought through.

There has been recent press, a group suggesting that we just tear down the Alaskan Way Viaduct and not rebuild it. I don't advocate that. But I do think it would be a very valuable exercise to figure out what the traffic patterns in Seattle would be, and how they could be minimized, the problems resulting from that, how they could be minimized, as a way to improve the project plan for the Alaskan Way Viaduct reconstruction.

In addition to these concerns, I also have pure financial concerns, with a finance background. If the project is going to take 10 years instead of 5 years, there's a much larger opportunity for losing money through interest rate increases, through construction increases, or through inflation, and it strikes me that careful consideration needs to be taken in trying to shorten the lengths of duration of this project from start to finish.

One other concern that I have is that the EIS Statement does not talk at all about how the project will be financed. I have a bit of concern that if a project is started without the full clarification of where the monies are coming from, that it is perhaps worse to start the project and stop it midstream, than to do nothing at all, because that would have a terrible impact on the neighborhood.

I used to live in Albuquerque, and the major freeway that's going to downtown Albuquerque was slated for reconstruction which was begun and halted, and it's been that way for over 10 years. And I have a concern that we not do that kind of thing to our city in the construction of this project. So, please carefully consider, when you draft you final EIS Statement, how to minimize the amount of time that it will take to build this project or also try to figure out the true costs associated with dragging out the extent of this project and the throughway, and all of the other things that will destroy the neighborhood. Thank you very much.

294

Comment

My name is Sandra Missner, and I do live on the waterfront. My concern is that I am in support of the six-lane tunnel option, but I am opposed to the temporary fly-over bypass that would direct interim traffic along Alaskan Way. And the reasons for this is that it would impact the commerce, the cruise line, all businesses down there, and the residents.

I did not see anywhere in the Draft EIS that for existing residents there would be any compensation for the years of construction, for the devaluation of our properties, if, in fact, we should have to sell during that time. So, I feel that there should be something written in the final EIS that would guarantee the property owners that during construction period, if they should have to sell their properties, that they are compensated adequately.

Also, I did not see anywhere in the Draft EIS that mentioned final feasibility impact analysis, which would state the pros and cons of all the impacts along the waterfront. And I think many of them probably will be mentioned by others, but for example, a staging area for when they do construction, where that will be, because of all of the parking, just all sorts of things that happen down there.

And that's pretty quick and simple, but those are my basic concerns. Thank you.

295

Comment

My name is Penny Swanberg and my home is on Alaskan Way. I'm just concerned that no alternative regarding traffic control or stopping of traffic has been mentioned, which would save the time of construction, maybe two years, and also maybe a half a billion dollars or more. And I'm talking with regard to The Old Pass down Alaskan Way.

And that's basically my concern, besides all the dust holes and the noise, and the disfigurement of Alaskan Way, which they've been trying to build, make attractive to tourists, since the '70's, when it was not very attractive. And I hate to go back to that disruption, to a disruption of that kind.

296

Comment

I favor a tunnel to open up the waterfront, make the land more valuable and usable and allow the beauty of that area to be enjoyed. I live on Queen Anne and want to be able to enter and leave 99 both heading north and south at some point on Queen Anne. This is an opportunity to remove an eyesore, cut down on traffic noise, improve property values, and make one of the most beautiful features of this city appreciated by others. Don't cut corners. The pay off in the long run is worth the expense.

297

Comment

I would like to see an alternative selected that removes the existing viaduct and turns Alaskan Way into a pleasant, waterfront boulevard with bike paths and sidewalks and greenspace. San Francisco, CA and Vancouver, B.C. has proven that a large city can survive and function without a large freeway/highway running through it. I also prefer a Surface alternative as the least costly. Engineering projects are too expensive for the current economy.

298

Comment

Draft EIS is deficient in evaluating impacts of construction on pedestrian traffic and safety on the waterfront. Draft EIS is deficient in evaluating impacts of dirt and noise pollution on the waterfront area during the proposed construction. Draft EIS is deficient in evaluating impacts of lost parking and waterfront access for residents and visitors to the waterfront, both during the proposed construction process as well as once the project is completed. Public hearings simply did not exist. Format was an open house with no opportunity for public comment. All comments were given in private formats -- such as online, written, or through transcription. It is my right to have my comments heard by other concerned citizens, and my right to be able to hear the comments of others. No opportunity was given for me to exercise these rights.

299

Comment

In addition to the comments that I gave to the court examiner at the downtown Seattle meeting, I also wanted to say that the EIS should consider other alternatives to the temporary bypass freeway that is suggested to be constructed at the northern end of Alaskan Way. Given the extreme amount of money, in both construction costs, time (and ultimately financing costs because of time spent on this traffic diversion), and lost property values and tourism revenues, these amounts should be quantified. Alternative uses for these funds for permanent projects, that could help mitigate traffic problems during construction, should be considered. Perhaps relocating the ferry terminal, constructing on/off ramps from Spokane street to 1st, 2nd, 3rd, 4th, 5th and 6th avenues, reconfiguring the mercer street off ramp to free up congestion on I-5, increase bus and ferry service from West Seattle to downtown, would be a better permanent use of funds. For the EIS to fairly represent the best s! solution for our State and City, please expand on these issues in the EIS statement.

300

Comment

I think that the viaduct should be repaired or perhaps a tunnel could be an alternative. To have the viaduct completely torn down and an alternative plan of having traffic re-routed through downtown would be complete madness. Traffic is already a nightmare through and around this city. Hearing that bus tunnels could be shut down etc sounds awful to me. A simple plan of repair/re-surface seems to me to be the viable option. The folks that believe the viaduct is an eye sore - I don't think so. It is part of Seattle's waterfront. Let them try and detour traffic. We stand to loose a lot more if we try other alternatives.

301

Comment

My preference for alternates would be (in descending order of preference): 1) Rebuild Alternative or Aerial Alternative (prefer Rebuild in general -- cheaper, and the advantages of the Aerial alternative aren't of much appeal to me.) 2) Tunnel Alternative 3) Bypass Tunnel Alternative I am completely against the Surface Alternative. ---- Just a brief description of why I made these choices: 1) I live in North Seattle, and currently use the Viaduct to get from here to places south of the city (West Seattle, the airport) -- NOT the city itself. In other words, a bypass. 2) I really enjoy the view of the Sound when driving North; and I find that the smaller, narrower lanes keep large trucks and people intent on going at high speeds to a minimum. 3) The tunnels are nice, but expensive; and I'm not particularly interested in park areas near the waterfront, particularly if they will be used for anything other than open park spaces. Also concerned on how stable tunnels would be over the long-term -- i.e., will we be dealing with a problem of this magnitude in 40-50 years? 4) In terms of eyesores, noise, etc. -- I don't work downtown, and rarely go there, so I'm much less concerned. Again, very nice job summarizing all this information -- thank you!

302

Comment

What are the assurances that the project costs will remain at a price set before construction begins and that not a penny more will be spent on it? We do not want another "Big Dig" like the one in Boston, Massachusetts. Can there be jail terms for anyone that asks for an extra penny?

It has come to my attention that a new Seawall is the "Most Important Project" before any other project can be done. Without a new Seawall all the money, all the fancy technology in engineering would be a total disaster, and a total waste. Please pay close attention to the new Seawall, which by the way needs to be replaced even if we don't build anything else.

303

Comment

I would like to see a "tear it down" and build a park alternative.

304

Comment

Looks like a lot of thought has gone into the alternatives analysis. Overall, I support the Tunnel Alternative.

305

Comment

Dear Coordinator,

We are very excited about the possibility of putting the viaduct below ground in either the option Tunnel or Bypass Tunnel or Surface. Tunnel would be our preference. Our waterfront is some of the most beautiful in the world and we should do everything in our power to keep it that way. These options would make it usable while retaining its beauty. In our opinions, Seattle missed the opportunity of its lifetime when it lost the Commons Park. Lets not let it happen again by not looking far enough in the future. Thank you for listening.

Sincerely,

John Roser
7830 SE 63rd Place
Mercer Island, WA 98040-4814

306

Comment

Linda Neilson
2112 S. 250th St.
Kent, WA 98032

April 28, 2004

Allison Ray
WSDOT Environmental Coordinator
Alaskan Way Viaduct and Seawall Replacement Project
999 Third Avenue, Suite 2424
Seattle, WA 98104

Allison Ray, Coordinator:

May I ask that the viaduct be built incorporating ancient Roman arch design. The strength and beauty of Roman arches should not be overlooked for the viaduct. I personally endorse only an above ground replacement for the old viaduct. A tunnel of the length that would replace the old viaduct is too long to be underground in an artificially lit space, not to mention the extra cost.

However the viaduct is replaced, all plans for its structure, lighting, and on and off ramps, multiple lanes and vehicles operating on it, running the gamut of small cars, to trucks and SUVs to heavy rigs should be put to the test of a virtual reality program to find errors, problems and identify road safety issues that would come from a busy road system involving a wide range of vehicles and drivers.

The reality program should involve numerous, different kinds of people "driving" at the same time different vehicles during "virtual" high and low traffic volumes and speeds, involving different ages in the drivers and don't forget to include driving at twilight, dawn, full daylight and nighttime. This could head off and eliminate unintended but short sighted engineering problems that could unfortunately be built into the replacement road.

I believe this "virtual" testing to be worth the extra effort and cost on what will be an enormously expensive project any way that one looks at it.

Thank you,

Linda Neilsen
ldneilsen@yahoo.com

307

Comment

Aerial Alternative seems the best considering cost, distribution and loss of parking. Is it going to a public vote? If so, who will be able to vote?

308

Comment

Such a small portion of the viaduct is in any danger of failing we should focus on that portion and repair it. Charlie Chong addressed it very well in his article that appeared in the West Seattle Herald. We are being taxed and levied enough - what with the "studies" (a way to do power lunches and fill our pockets) going on from the monorail, now seawall/viaduct we've had enough.

309

Comment

I understand that the State Legislature passed a bill in the last few days of this years session that eliminates the Aerial and Bypass options. If so, what impact, if any, does this have on the project?

310

Comment

The Battery Street flyover detour simulation as shown on page 143 exhibit 10-11 is a horrible concept. It runs immediately in from of our condo and would make living there impossible.

311

Comment

- 1) I get the impression that this project is moving forward in a thoughtful manner. Thank you for your time in communicating with the public.
- 2) I am most concerned about traffic mitigation - the more that can be kept open the better. I'm glad to see this provided for in your plans - many West Seattleites depend on the viaduct for business an pleasure commuting. I appreciate the improvements made in mitigating run-off effects.

312

Comment

I agree with the Tunnel alternative, not surface or Surface alternative.

313

Comment

General Comment and Proposal

Consider Stayed Cable Structure. Six lanes, with roadway at approximately one-half way between existing decks. Stayed Cable construction over land, could allow long spans using minimal intermediate supports between towers. These supports should also allow shorter towers as cables would be carrying less of a load. A single six-lane roadway would reduce waterfront noise. All noise from existing lower deck bouncing off of the bottom of the top deck would be eliminated. On and off ramps would pass under roadway and allow connections to existing ramps. All on/off merges would be from/to the right hand lane. An estimated (!) 12-15 towers would cover the proposed distance. This would reduce construction disturbances. Project could possibly be done with present viaduct in place.

The towers would be a noticeable visible presence. No space needle, but still a presence. Hopefully a pleasant one.

314

Comment

Need to rebuild existing.

Question on traffic impacts for all proposals.

315

Comment

Hi this Joan Douglas. I am 72 years old and I live in the Top Hat area. I use the viaduct at least 5 times a week. And I am strongly in favor of retaining it, replacing it as it is, repairing it, as it is, or whatever. I do not want to go through a tunnel. I think it would be a mistake to put it along the waterfront as a street. It's practically impossible to drive Alaskan Way now so I can't imagine putting all that traffic down there. So far as people losing their views I think they bought knowing that the viaduct so they are not losing anything they didn't have from the beginning so to speak. So that's the way I feel about it. We should keep it like it is. Thank you very much.

316

Comment

I would like to suggest either the Aerial or Bypass Tunnel alternatives even though there are several years difference in construction time. (I hope I am still alive at that time.) Whatever is chosen; work at it night and day. The citizens need this project done as quickly as possible. To be sure the work is done completely, hire only qualified union company workers. Also we need good family-wage jobs so people have good quality of life.

317

Comment

I have concerns that most of the proposed alternatives would add surface traffic along Alaskan Way with the potential to make the area less pedestrian friendly. The Bypass and Surface alternatives would be the worst for pedestrians. Only the Rebuild alternative retains the area for pedestrians - while maintaining parking for waterfront visitors.

318

Comment

The Tunnel seems to be the best alternative - Surface comprises too many things. I vote for opening up our waterfront.

319

Comment

The present viaduct serves West Seattle, Ballard, and downtown traffic efficiently. Don't mess with it. The present viaduct is beautiful. Let the tourists learn to appreciate art. Fix the seawall as cheaply as possible.

320

Comment

Just rebuild - Seawall has to be rebuilt or reinforced. In 1963 I was told viaduct built for earthquakes. Seawall never discussed. If shipping is so important that business should be making waves regarding the seawall failing.

Tunnels are unacceptable for me. Have you ever been trapped?]

Tunnels are noisy, poorly lighted, emergency access at best are nightmares.

Politics have so many projects going today without any sign of success.

If a 100 years necessary to see a failing seawall what are plans for a more stable seawall now?

What about ramps to reach the finished "event" regarding West Seattle, Delridge, Alki area? Bridge ramp?

With construction material costs rising so rapidly how can it be possible to cover project costs? Even at and with contract clause.

Can a seawall be done and then consider no more than 3 choices. 10 years of mess on the waterfront, 10 years of mess for a possible Monorail and Light rail getting hard to swallow.

Toll roads are not acceptable issues.

321

Comment

Seawall: The Port of Seattle has been taking property taxes from King County residents for many years to subsidize their poorly managed Port operations. They own most of the Seattle waterfront from Pier 91 on the north to Harbor Island on the South. It is time for them to give back to the taxpayers and pay all costs of the seawall replacement including any part of tunnel construction. If they refuse, the state legislature should remove their ability to levy property taxes and instead use that tax money for the seawall.

Options: Aerial structure are unacceptable from the aesthetic standpoint and their inability to withstand that pounding from heavy trucks. Our legislators do not understand the great damages that heavy trucks do to highways and road structures.

"Surface lanes only" should be considered if we cannot afford the cost of tunnels.

Tunnels: A 6 lane tunnel would be the best alternative but the bypass tunnel is acceptable to me from the economic viewpoint. In both case - use of the Battery Street Tunnel is ok.

322

Comment

I will ask you to consider the Latino workers that historically have been on Western Avenue seeking employment. They have come along way working with community members in Belltown. They are now organized inside the Day Worker Center (CASA Latina). If Day workers will be affected by the construction of the new viaduct, please consider relocation of their center to a suitable location with easy access to freeway and public transportation. I will also suggest that companies bidding for the work should be encouraged to hire workers from the center and help the economy of many people from our community.

323

Comment

I haven't heard of any plan to share the cost of the Seawall with the abutting property user or owners! It will enhance their property and should have the costs.

324

Comment

I think we should take the viaduct down and replace it with a park and living space. I want that to be one of the alternatives. Make it the sixth alternative, the do nothing alternative.

325

Comment

I am writing to advocate for an option that doesn't appear on your preferred list. Tear the viaduct down, and replace it with a surface street of no more than 4 lanes. Replacing the viaduct with another aerial structure is unacceptable...the noise and visual blight degrade the urban experience. Tunnels are too expensive. We'd be spending too much to enable a car culture and accommodate commuters. A surface option that creates up to eight lanes of traffic does nothing to reduce traffic noise, create a pedestrian-friendly experience, or mitigate the severing of the waterfront from our downtown core. The only advantage to this surface option is that it improves the waterfront experience for those who will be enjoying the view from adjacent buildings. I suggest that we not try to replace the capacity for transporting automobiles through the city. Run a passenger ferry from West Seattle, add buses and improve the mobility of buses through our city core (perhaps dedicate Third Avenue as a transit only arterial?), and build and expand a monorail system. Follow the lead of Vancouver BC, which uses congestion as a growth management tool. Follow the lead of San Francisco, which had the courage to tear down its elevated Embarcadero. Create an attractive option for current car commuters: beautiful, quiet, park-filled family-friendly high-density in-city living options. Thank you, Paul Beaudet

326

Comment

I thing the WSDOT and the other decision makers should take the Surface Alternative more seriously. The complexity and cost of this project make its actual construction a long shot, at best, given the "do nothing" mentality of the region's voters. The Surface Alternative, while forcing the region's drivers to re-think their driving habits, solves the sea wall problem and can be built within a budget that fits the realities of our new economy. The end result of this alternative will give Seattle a waterfront with traffic issues similar to the San Francisco waterfront: lots of cars and trolleys, yet plenty of people using their waterfront on foot. Please remember that this discussion is not just a wonderful class project for our state's engineers and architects. Real money and a difficult consensus will be necessary to bring this project to life, and the Surface Alternative can actually win a reluctant majority.

327

Comment

Dear Coordinator,

We are very excited about the possibility of putting the viaduct below ground in either the option Tunnel or Bypass Tunnel or Surface. Tunnel would be our preference. Our waterfront is some of the most beautiful in the world and we should do everything in our power to keep it that way. These options would make it usable while retaining its beauty. In our opinions, Seattle missed the opportunity of its lifetime when it lost the Commons Park. Lets not let it happen again by not looking far enough in the future. Thank you for listening.

Sincerely,

Ellie Roser
7830 SE 63rd Place
Mercer Island, WA 98040-4814

328

Comment

The Aerial Alternative is the way to go for this project. It enhances the strengths of the current structural and corrects it's weaknesses. Such as narrow lanes and no shoulders. Some minor tweaking would make it perfect. Putting the two north bound lanes of Alaska Way under the new viaduct accomplishes nothing positive, adds no capacity and just eliminates parking. Leave the surface streets in the current configuration. A Win/Win situation.

329

Comment

I believe the Aerial Alternative is the best alternative presented. Wider lanes and shoulders are a great idea. I've often wondered what I would do if my car broke down on the current viaduct with no shoulders. I do question the reasoning in changing the surface streets losing all that parking and still only having two lanes north and south on Alaskan Way. All in all I think this alternative is the best way to meet this transportation need.

330

Comment

I do not favor the surface alternative. It would decrease mobility and add to congestion downtown.
I also do not like the bypass tunnel alternative because it would not allow people in Ballard to use the viaduct to go south.
It is important to consider freight mobility in any options.
Overall, I favor the tunnel option.

331

Comment

It appears that traffic flow on Alaskan way will be increased with all of the alternatives presented. I was under the impression that it is desirable to increase the connection between downtown and the waterfront by doing away with the physically and visually obstructing viaduct. None of these plans address this issue, in fact by increasing the traffic flow on Alaskan way, you will actually isolate the waterfront from downtown even more than it is now. Also, it does not seem possible to increase the traffic and make the waterfront more pedestrian friendly.

332

Comment

The EIS does not adequately address the ability of design changes and the use of advances in construction materials to mitigate the noise levels with the rebuild alternative. The measurement of decibel levels in the EIS which is all well and good, does not mention any studies by acoustical engineers that might be of value in decreasing the noise levels from the viaduct.

333

Comment

The tunnel option is the only realistic option to choose, even though it will be the most expensive. It is vital to the city to re-establish connection with the waterfront, which eliminates the aerial options. The surface option cannot possibly serve the needs of the traffic using the facility - we already have a surface street in this location that doesn't work all that well.

334

Comment

Favor tunnel alternative because it opens up the area along the sound. Also, it permits access (via Western) to QA and Ballard. This is critical. Would also like to see easy access to/from West Seattle Bridge and 99 going north and south.

335

Comment

Name the new Seawall "Gribble Memorial Seawall."

336

Comment

While each of the proposed schemes have negative points, the surface scheme seems to have the greatest negative impact. It would be a great danger to the plethora of citizens and tourists who walk or bike between the waterfront and the downtown area. It would be an eyesore to see so much traffic. And the studies show this it would be noisy and extremely inefficient in terms of commute times.

I find the Bypass Tunnel to be the best solution because it provides an express route underground for thru traffic and maintains a manageable surface. However, I would like to propose modification based on a freeway system I witnessed in Barcelona, Spain.

In this scheme, the bypass tunnel is built similarly but with an open air roof. In other words, SR 99 is sunken to allow for a more shallow tunnel which requires less excavation. No ventilation is necessary. Noise is reduced. And pedestrian overpasses and parks can be built over parts of the road to allow for safe circulation and create unique green spaces.

This scheme has the same traffic capacity as the surface scheme so it might be considered a hybrid between the bypass tunnel and surface schemes.

337

Comment

Well, I've been hearing a lot of people talking about this project and the alternatives, and I have been so appalled at some of the remarks. I have detested the viaduct for as long as I've lived in Seattle, and that's most of my life. It is a visual obstruction, it is an auditory imposition on its area, and it's awful. And the idea that the view of a few people driving through should be favored over the people who live, work, actually get out of the cars and walk there, is incredibly selfish, to my mind.

I don't like the surface solution because it puts a freeway at the surface level, it would be awful, it would make crossing dangerous, and the noise would be just as bad as it is now. I don't like the aerial or the replacement, because it's continuing the problem. The tunnel was extremely expensive when it was first proposed, but they have reduced the cost of it to the point that I don't see why it should even be questioned anymore. The bypass is too much of a cut. It doesn't serve the needs.

I think the choice is clear, you need to tunnel. We need to stop talking about it, we need to start doing it, we need to get it funded. And I hope that that's what happens.

338

Comment

Okay. My name is Brian Fredrick, and I am a resident, and I live on Alaskan Way, in Seattle.

I would like to address two inadequacies of the SEPA preliminary report. The first is I believe that there was inadequate consideration of not maintaining the current traffic flows during the construction period. It appears to me that there seems to be a presumption that current traffic flows have to be maintained during construction period. This may not necessarily have to be the case.

The other inadequate consideration that I would like to have addressed would be the impact upon residential uses in the affected area and, in particular, on Alaskan Way. It seems to me that maintaining and encouraging a mix of uses in the affected area is very important during the construction period. I do not believe that the preliminary SEPA has adequately considered the impact of the alternatives on residential use. Thank you very much.

339

Comment

I am Elizabeth Frederick, and I live on the waterfront on Alaskan Way.

I am concerned about the large Battery Street fly-over detour, I believe it's called, that you have a picture of on one of these story boards. And I'm concerned that that seems like a tremendous waste of taxpayer money to go to the expense of building something like that.

And I'm also concerned that the project might run out of money, and that that might be what we're left with. It looks like a huge monstrosity that would greatly affect the waterfront area and the vision that Seattleites have of their city, as being a beautiful city. And I think one of the beauties of it is the waterfront area.

I think also that the EIS has not adequately addressed the traffic flow on Alaskan Way, and the loss of parking spaces, the loss of the public's ability to get to the waterfront and be able to use the waterfront as a necessity of everyday life in the city. Thank you.

I think that I neglected to say in my first comment about the Battery Street fly-over detour that the EIS did not adequately address the costs and the inconvenience of that structure.

340

Comment

Okay. My proposal would be the tunnel is the one that I would like to go with, the big one, six-lane. And that's pretty much it. Basically, that's it. I don't know what else I could add to it. I'd just like the tunnel the best.

I guess that all I have. I hope that that will help. I don't know how much it will help.

341

Comment

My preference is 'Aerial.' Make it a thing of beauty!

I understand that it has the longest construction period, but I also understand that my north-south corridor is open the whole time.

The price is right too.

There is a sixth 'alternative: repair the seawall - tear down viaduct - build a floating bridge.

342

Comment

build the tunnel and build it as fast as possible

343

Comment

In the spiral-bound book

"Battery St. Flyover Detour" (pp. 22-23)

See exhibit 2-30 (photo) and exhibit 2-31 (chart)

I am a homeowner of a waterfront condo unit in Waterfront Landing. I am appalled to see what would happen to my waterfront view, with a bridge built over, above, and in front of my apartment - this for 4 to 6 years!! At age 80, I would never have my view again! The whole purpose of my purchase in 1998 was for the view of the harbor. Up to now, the value of my apartment has appreciated sharply. With the awful proposal of the "Battery St. Flyover Detour" my beautiful waterfront property is ruined!!

344

Comment

Even though this is the most expensive alternative, the additional benefits are numerous for really only the "extra" cost over the other 4 alternatives: 1)Extra surface capacity that will be freed up. No pillars

2) Instead of building two projects; seawall & viaduct it becomes one tunnel/seawall combo, there should be some savings there.

3) View restoration is priceless

4) Loosing the poor man's view is about the only downside, so we can still take Alaskan Way & visit the waterfront more often!!!

345

Comment

give pedestrians a chance. tunnel. do not fill surface with wall to wall vehicles. 5-lane blvd maximum i.e. DECREASE CAPACITY. street car should be integrated into pedestrian walkway instead of increased r.o.w. and barricades. Euros have no difficulties running them down center of wide pedestrian walkways. shift surface traffic in place of exist viaduct(east), reclaimed r.o.w. should become pedestrian space on water-side. i am an architect with 10 years experience on urban regeneration schemes in (mainly) europe. trust me. easy for cars, trucks to find alternate routes-difficult or impossible for pedestrians. absolutely invaluable land for future of Seattle. think big.

346

Comment

I'm for the tunnel. I think the other ones don't really help with the traffic flowing problem. I think esthetically it works the best, too, as long as there isn't some hidden agenda of real estate big guys. I think it's real important that we do this wisely, because it's such a main thoroughfare, north and south, and it can't all be rerouted all that time over to 5. It would just be chaos.

And also, too, we as taxpayers "grudgingly" -- say this with quote marks around it -- have funded two major sports arenas, and now, if we don't plan this out very well, we've just funded something that we're not going to get people to and from, without just one big hassle. So, as I see it, of all of the plans, it does, for me, come down to doing the tunnel.

347

Comment

I'm here to protest tearing the Alaska Viaduct down because I don't think there's been enough studies to look into repairing it. Because, it's one of the jewels of Seattle. It's a jewel of the Seattle, because how can we ever look at the Ocean when they put it in a tunnel?

And many people in this Seattle appreciate the viaduct when they go to work every day. I think they should put more effort on the repairs to bring it up to the earthquake specifications. And there's some studies out now that say this is feasible. I think there should be more effort in saving the viaduct, than going through all the expense that we would have to incur to replace it, no matter what it is, and we don't have that type of money. And we should have a committee to look into this.

That's the end of my -- I think I should also, that the expenses incurred should be used in other ways, because we're in big trouble here in Seattle. And it appears that developers are pushing this more than common sense.

348

Comment

I prefer the aerial construction for replacing the viaduct. Of course, we need a seawall, that for sure. Thank you.

Comment

My comments on the EIS are pretty small, but at least they're very, very important. The maritime sector that works in the Lake Washington Ship Canal are primarily served by two fueling facilities, one being Covich and Williams and one being Ballard Oil.

The entire maritime industry is primarily served out of four fixed facilities in the whole State of Washington. It's our responsibility to assure that those maritime fishing industry vessels are supplied with fuels, lubricants, et cetera.

If we accept a tunnel solution based on the current regulations of the Seattle Fire Department, which would be the governing controlling agency, then it will be impossible for us to remove combustible, flammable or materials, primarily the combustible materials.

We need to service this industry from Harbor Island to Ballard. There are days when we have a lot of business with the fishing industry, and we can require as much as 15 truck and trailer loads a day from each of us, which effectively could be 30 truck and trailer loads a day. So, therefore, the tunnel solution requires that there be no flammable, at least from the things we're seeing, to be no flammable and/or combustible materials entering that tunnel.

If we do a rebuild or an aerial solution we will be able to still remove those materials, as we do now, down through that corridor. It's a major, major corridor for the nation's largest fishing industry.

We have a large contention of tug boats and small freighters that service Alaska that work out of Lake Washington Ship Canal. It is, as far as I'm concerned, the maritime capital of the world.

The only alternative, if we put a tunnel down, is to put truck and trailers down to the surface street. With the amount of tourism and the amount of conflicts that are presented by pedestrians, buses, bicycles and other modes of transportation, that the time to bring a load out to Ballard would probably increase at least two to three fold. We store, in our facility, about 45 thousand gallons of diesel, and there are days that we move 150,000 gallons through our facility. So, that transportation corridor is essential for us to service this fishing industry.

The other thing that I'd like to comment on is that the rebuild of the Alaskan Way Viaduct, as far as I can see, would be the only option that will allow incremental financing, that to come up with the financial burden of the \$4-billion, or whatever it is, may not all be available at once. But as we are well aware of the areas that are compromised in Alaskan Way Viaduct now, that that Alaskan Way Viaduct could be partially rebuilt as we go and rebuild those structures that are in jeopardy of falling down and interrupt this transportation corridor.

It is imperative that we do something, because if we do nothing, or if we put it down on the surface, the link between all the supplies needed for this industry will drive the commercial fishing industry, and probably the entire maritime industry, out of this area. And the only viable place that I could see that they would go, would be into Vancouver, Canada, who are the only ones, with NAFTA and everything else, that would be receptive of receiving this billion to \$2-billion dollars a year that comes into this economy. This is part of the outside capital that drives the City, and I think it really needs to be looked at from an economic standpoint and what it means to jeopardize the maritime community, since most of it is housed and serviced from the shipyards and the facilities out on Lake Washington Ship Canal.

And also, any one of the option must include a northwest port hole out of 15th Northwest, which is an access by the Elliot and/or Western option. In a lot of the preliminaries that list that connection as an option, that isn't an option. It's a necessity. Everything that's serviced on Magnolia, Queen Anne and Ballard, say probably west of 8th Northwest, accesses the viaduct via that corridor. If we restrict that and compress it any more, it will just be grid-locked, no matter what have we do.

350

Comment

Good evening. My name is Steven W. Andreasen, A-n-d-r-e-a-s-e-n. My address is 2000 Alaskan Way, unit 157, Seattle, Washington 98121.

I'd like to offer the following comments in connection with the Draft EIS: I am responding to the EIS as a homeowner and on behalf of our family, which lives on Alaskan Way. The neighborhood in which we walk to work, engage in recreational activities, and shop, will be significantly impacted by the project, as described in the EIS. The project corridor is our front yard.

We recognize the need for dealing with the seawall and the viaduct, but believe that the EIS does not adequately address the following points viewed from the perspective of a homeowner:

Point 1: The EIS does not adequately address the options available to shorten the construction period by the complete closure of the construction corridor to through traffic. Diverting traffic away from the construction corridor during construction should be viewed as an alternative and considered in detail. This would reduce the period of impact on the residential neighborhood and its business.

Point 2: If through traffic in the construction corridor is continued during the construction period, I do not believe that the EIS adequately assesses the way in which the diverted traffic flow and how it will impact our neighborhood and its business.

Point 3: I do not believe that the EIS adequately addresses the impact on residential property values within our neighborhood during and after the construction.

Point 4: I do not believe that the EIS adequately assesses the impact on local businesses on which we depend for daily services and goods.

Point 5: Parking is already at a premium in our neighborhood. I do not believe the EIS adequately assesses the impact of the construction project on the availability of parking for guests who may wish to visit families living in the construction corridor, and for others who need parking in connection with local businesses.

Point 6: I do not believe there has been adequate consideration given in the EIS to mitigation measures to preserve the livability of our residential neighborhood during the construction period.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

351

Comment

Andrea Menin: I want to register my comments about the seawall and viaduct replacement. I would like to see them build a tunnel. Even though it's the most expensive, it seems like the best alternative. I don't mind if it's a bypass or a regular tunnel, as long as it gets tunneled.

That's it.

What do you think, Anna?

Anna Crean: Same as her.

Andrea Menin: Same as me? Can you say it louder? You kind of want an aerial thing, don't you?

Anna Crean: I don't really care.

Andrea Menin: You don't really care? Do you want to be able to look down at the traffic, like you do now, or do you want to be able to go underneath it?

Anna Crean: Look down at the traffic.

Andrea Menin: So she wants an aerial.

352

Comment

It's important to end up with sufficient capacity, for today as well as the future, so I highly recommend the Tunnel alternative. This alternative would improve waterfront area and provide a more pedestrian and bike friendly environment. More open space than concrete! Access at Elliott and Western is vital for the entire NW end of town plus Interbay (residents and industry).

353

Comment

I believe the Tunnel alternative is the best solution for both the local economy and the visual appearance of the city while allowing for the most long term alternatives for future adjustments as our transportation needs change.

My biggest concern about the Tunnel alternative would be access. It doesn't appear to be access at the downtown areas. What would the aerial off ramps at S. Royal Brougham Way look like? What kind of congestion preventative measures are you taking at these locations?

Pedestrian safety and access are vital to the tourism and culture of the waterfront.

354

Comment

Seattle waterfront is the most valuable public asset that we possess. I would encourage a long term vision on this project. I encourage a tunnel (not bypass tunnel) in order to create a waterfront that will make Seattle's waterfront compatible and competitive with other great waterfronts (San Francisco, Long Beach, Chicago, etc.).

In addition to the use of a tunnel; I would like to see cars removed completely from the waterfront area to the trolley. This would enable a boardwalk, pedestrian friendly, tourist friendly, retail business friendly, environment that is badly needed in Seattle and would contribute to the overall attraction of Seattle as a "destination" as well as create a destination downtown to locals. The market is in close proximity to the waterfront (both jewels of the city) is just a great and unique opportunity to make this an exciting new city.

I would like the committee to look at the most profitable, popular and economically viable areas in the nation tight now in terms of destination areas. A quick look at California especially shows that areas where autos have been removed have been the most successful in recent years. Santa Monica, CA, Universal Citywalk, the waterfront of San Francisco and San Diego are all testaments to this. The people drive great distances and pay large sums (just to park) to visit these auto-free zones. Particularly poignant is the fact that these are in areas where autos dominate the landscape. These are loud and clear signals that auto-free urban zones are of great interest and desired all over the nation. (See Portland, Chicago, Austin, etc.) Please let's start planning some of our city for the people who pay taxes, who use it and who would get so much more use out of accessible space that finally would not truncate the city from its precious waterfront resource.

Finally, I hope that the cost is not the determining factor. I would be happy to pay more taxes to fund a long-term, beneficial solution in terms of use, noise, pollution, public space, future city growth and profitability.

Thank you for the information and presentation tonight.

Comment

SR99/Seawall project comments

1) I strongly favor the "tunnel" (6 lanes) option - it'll be underground (which reduces noise and opens up views) and provides good (albeit shy of "ideal") connections to the north. Yes, this option is expensive, but let's spend the money and do it right. Twenty years from now, what will we wish we had done?

2) Don't fill in Broad Street. Instead, convert it to a cut 'n cover tunnel extending past at least Third Avenue. This will allow for smoother traffic flow and the opportunity to create a softer transition from Belltown to the Seattle Center. Likewise, bury Mercer Street from Aurora to at least past Queen Anne Avenue (for both tunnels, provide a limited number of connections to surface streets), the area bounded by Thomas/Fifth/Mercer/Aurora can be redeveloped as a whole. Taylor Avenue could (should) be extended south of Mercer (which would pass beneath) and then connect to Fifth Avenue via an "S" curve.

3) Funding - Referendum 51 failed in part due to its high price tag. For such ballot issues, its always a guess as to what price point to submit - too high, and it fails; too low, and (if it passes...) it won't provide enough money to do much.

How about this: For the dollar amount, present a single ballot question with several amounts (\$0, \$1 billion, \$2 billion). Each voter selects one amount. After the election, tally the votes starting from the highest amount working downward. The dollar amount that provides that votes to create a majority is the amount authorized. Example:

\$	Votes (%)		
5	5		
4	15	45%	80%
3	25		
2	35		
1	15		
0	15		

\$2 billion is authorized.

Advantage: the votes choose the amount, and most likely some amount is authorized (as opposed to zip from Referendum 51).

A similar process could be used to select which projects to build with the authorized funds.

Comment

Ms. Allison Ray
Alaskan Way Viaduct and Seawall Replacement Project Office
999 Third Avenue, Suite 2424
Seattle, WA 98104

Re: Comments on Draft Environmental Impact Statement (the "EIS")

Dear Ms. Ray:

This letter will confirm points I intend to make by way of oral comments at the EIS hearing on April 29, 2004.

I am responding to the EIS as a homeowner and on behalf of our family, which lives on Alaskan Way.

The neighborhood in which we walk to work, engage in recreational activities, and shop will be significantly impacted by the project, as described in the EIS. The project corridor is our front yard.

We recognize the need for dealing with the Seawall and the Viaduct, but believe that the EIS does not adequately address the following points, viewed from the perspective of a homeowner.

- 1) The EIS does not adequately address the options available to shorten the construction period, by the complete closure of the construction corridor to through traffic. Complete diversion of traffic away from the construction corridor during construction should be viewed as an alternative and considered in detail. This would reduce the period of impact on the residential neighborhood and its businesses.
- 2) If through traffic in the construction corridor is continued during the construction period, I do not believe that the EIS adequately assessed the way in which the diverted traffic will flow, and how it will impact our neighborhood and its businesses.
- 3) I do not believe that the EIS adequately addresses the impact on residential property values within our neighborhood during and after the construction.
- 4) I do not believe that the EIS adequately assesses the impact on local businesses, on which we depend for daily services and goods.
- 5) Parking is already at a premium in our neighborhood. I do not believe that EIS adequately assesses the impact of the construction project on the availability of parking for guests who may wish to visit families living in the construction corridor, and for others who need parking in connection with local businesses.
- 6) I do not believe there has been adequate consideration given in the EIS to mitigation measures to preserve the livability of our residential neighborhood during the construction period.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

Sincerely,

Steven W. Andreasen

357

Comment

Re: The Viaduct

First I have heard the TV news persons call it "decrepit" - "half-century old" - "crumbling" - "earthquake damaged" - and "antique roadway."

I have also heard that concrete strengthens for its first 100 years!

I never counted the columns, but there must be at least 300 to 400.

Most of it is built on unstable fill behind a seawall. I think it is standing amazingly well!

One column has settled and is down about two inches. They said it is sinking, but a recent check showed it had not changed in the past year. It could be cut loose and raised - repaired - or at most - replaced! The surface is getting a bit rough from wear. This could be repaired or black-topped.

Lets leave the viaduct alone and get another street thru town - maybe submerged under 5th Ave to miss the railroad tunnel!

358

Comment

Why is Mercer St. still included if the Battery Street Tunnel is unchanged? These revisions actually reduce eastbound travel times (Parsons-Brinckerhoff study) and cost \$200 million while providing no transportation benefit and doing nothing about the viaduct/seawall areas that need repair.

359

Comment

Why hasn't a stand-alone seawall renovation project been considered? If RTID fails, what happens?

360

Comment

L. Erickson Hall

4-29-04

Concerned

1. Viaduct interface with Highway 99 necessary now and in future.
2. Combining viaduct and seawall updating makes sense.
3. Viaduct northbound view one of Seattle's greatest assets.
4. Waterfront park only makes sense with underground parking - example: Boston Commons.
5. So many people entertain themselves in downtown Seattle - from the suburbs. Planning must include considerable car traffic thru 1st half of 21st century.
6. Removing viaduct with no replacement not an option.
7. Park planning needs Elliott Bay new plan (water/shore) docks and functions (ferries) as well. Private property compliments this I know.
8. Move on, one way or the other.
9. Railroading still a vital part of life here. What are they happy with?
10. Elliott Bay's cleanup and vitality essential to all this too.
11. Puget Sound and Lake Washington are here to stay. North-South travel, even with monorail, must be preserved so railroads, trucks, airplanes and automobiles can handle expected population growth. Why?
- 12 Puget Sound is a great place to live!

Fine public presentation, Thank you!

361

Comment

Let's reintegrate the waterfront with downtown like Portland, OR. Their waterfront park is delightful. I think the tunnel alternatives accomplish this. In the long run the extra expense will be worth it.

362

Comment

I would prefer an Aerial structure to a tunnel. If we cannot rebuild the existing structure then we should incrementally replace it with a new viaduct. I believe it could be done in such a way that the viaduct would be largely usable during the construction. I envision new bridge supports built between the existing supports. Then, by use of temporary spans, similar to the adjusting spans at the Puget Sound Ferry docks we should be able to continue using the "old" part that remains as we build the new one from one end to the other. This would require deck heights fairly near the heights of the existing decks.

Thank you for your consideration of my thoughts on this matter.

363

Comment

I really don't see how the Tunnel or Surface options improve "life at street level," or provide better waterfront/pedestrian access when there will be glorified vehicular boulevards and cross traffic.

Has anyone addressed beautifying spaces beneath an aerial or rebuild route?

The Aerial and Rebuild alternatives would provide the most expedient access to Magnolia/Queen Anne via Western/15th as well as North/South route. I like that I'm able to enjoy our spectacular aerial views of Elliott Bay and cityscape, in perspective rather than from street level. These two options appear to provide the most longterm North - South traffic volume capacity.

364

Comment

Strong consideration should be given to rebuild - It's achievable, cost effective, and the least disruptive.

365

Comment

Given similar projects in the East, I suggest re-examining the option of filling underneath the present piers with concrete and locating the tunnel under the broadened shoreline.

366

Comment

From what I see from your display, it looks like the Tunnel would be the best - even though the cost is high.

367

Comment

- With public access shoreline and views shrinking as fast as you can say apartment - note that the view from the aerial structure is the best in town.
- If the Bypass Tunnel were to be selected, what land use and/or height restrictions etc would come into play in the opened up adjacent land?
- Surface street replacement is not a viable alternative.
- While the City Council is strongly opting for an option that does not include an aerial - the result no matter what is not going to resemble an attractive drive like Tom McCall Park in Portland unless we sink or move all Pier structures.

368

Comment

- With public access shoreline and views shrinking as fast as you can say apartment - note that the view from the aerial structure is the best in town.
- If the Bypass Tunnel were to be selected, what land use and/or height restrictions etc would come into play in the opened up adjacent land?
- Surface street replacement is not a viable alternative.
- While the City Council is strongly opting for an option that does not include an aerial - the result no matter what is not going to resemble an attractive drive like Tom McCall Park in Portland unless we sink or move all Pier structures.

During construction of all alternatives, will there be provisions for bike traffic along the waterfront, I.e. as an example: biking south through E. Myrtle Park to the waterfront surface streets in order to gain access to downtown?

369

Comment

On the no-build board - a quote from a Mr. Ryan Hanes indicates that experts believe the viaduct will pancake in the same manner as I-880 in the Loma Prieta Quake. This is simply not true (and in fact it's what lots of people said would happen before the Nisqually Quake - a major 6.8 event).

370

Comment

1) Seawall: Let's educate all of Seattle regarding the gribble! School kids may find it as fascinating as dinosaurs. Fundraisers with T-shirts could promote awareness - Artists could do an amazing job to amplify awareness and raise money.

2) Other: The bridge proposal is my favorite. Beautiful and sensible. The approach to Boeing Field could be altered. Build the Bridge!

371

Comment

As a Seattle native, and waterfront resident for the past 5 or 6 years, I'm very aware of what a unique part of town the waterfront is. Through the ongoing conversation about the viaduct and seawall replacement, I've gotten a much clearer picture of what the waterfront MIGHT be in the future. I think most Seattleites view the central waterfront as a collection of tourist-oriented shops selling the same "gee-gaws" as most other major city waterfront areas. Some may pay the occasional visit for a concert or to enjoy one of Alaskan Way's three fine dining restaurants but, for most, the waterfront is a place to bring out-of-town visitors to shop for trinkets and pig-out on hotdogs or deep fried fish and chips. I'm sure Seattle residents do occasionally succumb to the need for deep fried fish, though it's getting to be a pretty infrequent guilty pleasure. As for the trinket vendors, I doubt that many locals visit those shops in a given week...or year, for that matter. The point is, today's central waterfront is not a part of town that area residents have much reason to frequent. Any plan for replacing the Alaskan Way Viaduct must take into account future public use of the central waterfront. The waterfront could be so much more than a tourist trap. With proper planning, it might be one of Seattle's most desirable areas serving the needs of locals and out of town visitors alike. The full tunnel approach, as opposed to the Bypass Tunnel Alternative, leaves Alaskan Way a 4 lane, local access street rather than a 6 lane Aurora-like thru-way. I think the Tunnel Alternative provides Seattle with the most options for future development of the waterfront.

372

Comment

In different times building another alternative to the Viaduct would make sense, but the need for a viaduct replacement is happening at time when there are other projects and other needs requiring our tax resources. It is not practical to fulfill dreams of a different waterfront unmarred by a viaduct. I think the best course of action is to choose the least costly alternative and then add ideas that will mitigate the blight caused by the project. I tend to favor rebuilding the Viaduct, but consider material other than concrete that will soften its impact, that is, material that may make it more attractive rather than appear as concrete wall. Can't it look like an attractive steel bridge? Would this be cheaper? Knock the Viaduct and do nothing should be considered. I transit the Viaduct Monday thru Friday, so I know this is traffic havoc, but in the end people will cope, and maybe in the future, when there is more tax revenue available, another alternative can be constructed. Sincerely, Joe Stack Ballard

373

Comment

My preference would be for either one of the tunnels, if only to get rid of the ugliness of the current viaduct. Reconnecting the city with the waterfront is aesthetically pleasing and worth the cost, in my opinion, especially if the amount of traffic that can be carried by the new configuration is increased relative to today's viaduct. Regarding the two tunnel options, it is imperative that access at the north end to/from Elliott Ave. or Western Ave. be provided. Access to these streets is important for those living in the Belltown, Interbay, Magnolia, Ballard, and Queen Anne neighborhoods. If it is necessary to trade access from 99 to Alaskan Way against access from 99 to Elliott/Western, I think that access to Elliott/Western is much more important. The next best option after the tunnels would be an aerial structure. By far the least desirable option would be the "surface street" alternative. This will never move enough traffic to make a difference. A total waste of money. And Alaskan Way will be choked with traffic and pollution about 20 hours a day.

374

Comment

I prefer the viaduct be rebuilt. It really serves us Ballard residents and is an excellent alternative to I-5. The tunnel would be a money pit! It only benefits downtown condo owners.

375

Comment

I strongly favor the rebuild alternative. I am an occasional driver from Fremont to West Seattle. To me, the downtown waterfront is for tourists and I get no pleasure from it other than the views from the viaduct. The panorama out over Elliot Bay on a sunny afternoon or late at night are some of my happiest moments in Seattle. thank you.

376

Comment

I live on Alaskan Way. I am 62 years old and this is my retirement home. Please understand this. In round numbers, the average life span of a man is 80 years. Call it 80 inches. If you take a tape measure and lay out 80 inches and subtract your age (mine is 62), then I have just 18 inches left. That's not very much, and how much of that will be a comfortable quality of life. Your Aerial proposal puts a temporary (10 years) structure right in front of my home. For the best years of my life, that are left, I will not have the view or quiet enjoyment of my retirement home. Your draft report does not take into consideration the most important thing, that is, the quality of life of the people who would have to live under the conditions you are proposing. And, in my case, if you choose this scheme, how do you put a price on my life? Please consider this and DO NOT build this temporary structure in front of my home. Thank you.

377

Comment

You have not considered the effect of the temporary structure on Alaskan Way (for the Aerial Alternative) on property values during it's use (7-10 years). the length of time is to long to be ignored. 10 years is a long time out of our lives. We live on Alaskan Way. Even considering the costs, the structure is horrendously obtrusive.

378

Comment

I live on Alaskan Way. You have not considered a "long range plan" or century plan in your Draft EIS. The reason the city and state are faced with this dilemma in the first place is because of poor planning. A true long range plan would address the cause of the problem. The solution may be entirely different from any of the proposals you have given us. Please consider this. Thank you.

You have not considered the fact that for the next 7-10 years there will be another viaduct, as a temporary structure. this definitely has an environmental effect, as one of the reasons for doing away with the viaduct in the first place was because it is an eye sore. I live on Alaskan way.

379

Comment

Allison Ray,

I have been a lifelong Seattle resident, 52 years, and proud of it. I remember when Highway 99 was the main route of travel. That time has past however and it needs replacing. The solution must be cost effective, done in a timely manner and improve efficiency. Of the 5 plans to replace the viaduct, I support the Bypass Tunnel. It appears to be cost effective by utilizing a tunnel through downtown and freeing up the waterfront area to be more citizen friendly. The time frame is acceptable, being less than other options. It would also have more lanes to travel with. The other options require more dollars or more time to build. A surface roadway is the most idiotic choice. An aerial would take much too long to build. Replacing the viaduct would create massive traffic jams and NOT solve the problem of safety.

I live in West Seattle and use the viaduct every day. As one of the 110,000 auto's a day using 99, I consider it of the highest priority of our transportation problems.

Please make a choice and BUILD IT. It is past time when our leaders show direction and commitment.

Realistically,

Peter Giese
PO Box 16303
Seattle, WA 98116

380

Comment

I already submitted comments on the schemes but I wanted to also comment on the public hearing itself. I attended the hearing in Ballard on Apr. 29. I was very impressed by the amount of information available. The history and studies were organized very well and were very educational. I liked all of the exhibits that demonstrated what the noise would be like and what the schemes would look like. That was excellent. It was great to have people from the DOT there to be able to explain how each scheme would be built. The visual aids and the representatives there helped me to understand what the obstacles are and helped me to differentiate facts from myths. Thank you for making the effort to provide the public with an educational forum and giving us the opportunity to participate in the project.

381

Comment

I believe Rebuild is the best and most practical alternative, with the following proviso: Added to the project at a relatively nominal cost should be a "scrub" of City plans, codes and ordinances to find every opportunity to make revisions that will induce developments of a scale that will "overcome" the apparent barrier of the Viaduct. The Viaduct is not the "barrier" today that it was initially because high rise buildings, Harbor Steps, ivy on structure, etc. "subdue it." I-5 is less and less a barrier because of the Convention Center, etc. Urban design and scale can diminish the effect of the Viaduct while retaining the aesthetic experience of driving on it.

382

Comment

As Seattle grows and continues to house a larger population downtown, the city must seek to find more public open space and create a city that is livable 24 hours a day. Please study the quality of life benefits from replacing the current viaduct with either a street level or tunnel approach. The foot print of the current viaduct could be turned into a linear park that parallels the waterfront. Please consider purchasing from Republic Parking the surface parking lot at Western and Seneca and after construction turning this area into a park. A set of steps from First Avenue could be built under the existing Seneca Street exit ramp to connect First and Western. This connection would be much like the Harbor Steps open space. Thank you for the opportunity to provide input.

383

Comment

Can we please have all the money (150%) for this project before we start tearing down anything. I hope we don't tear down the Viaduct, and then find out the city doesn't have the funds to rebuild. I would also like to express my vote for the Rebuild Alternative, and NO tunnel. I also hope the wealthier of our city residents who own condos on the waterfront will not have a larger pull to have the viaduct torn down to have it replaced by a tunnel so their view would improve. After all, the viaduct was here first, before the million dollar condos. We need the viaduct, the surface streets are already jammed, the freeway is jammed, and this is with the viaduct. Can you just imagine what it would be like to drive downtown or the waterfront, all the traffic? And if or when the big one hits I personally would rather be above ground on the viaduct than in a tunnel.

384

Comment

Please study a "no-highway alternative " for the Alaskan Way Viaduct for the EIS. As a resident a block away from the Viaduct, I fear for my safety and the structure needs to be removed .

385

Comment

[Abbreviations: alt. = alternative] 1. It sure was difficult to gain access to a copy of the DEIS, which was discussed by phone w. Ms. Ray. When you send a copy to a public access agency, that doesn't mean the public can readily see it, and it may take (many) weeks to surface. 2. Consider a 10 week (or longer) complete closure of SR 99 in the construction zone EACH summer, if that will expedite completion of the project. Possibly also for 2 weeks at Christmas-New Years (parallel to the annual Boeing and public schools closure). Object: save \$\$ and earlier completion. 3. My overall preference is the Tunnel alt. Second = Bypass Tunnel. 4. All excavated soils and spoils, and demolition detritus, and construction materials should enter and leave the site preferably by barge, then by rail, and least preferably by truck. 5. For the Tunnel alt., suggest: at-grade roadway on south end of project, and provide ramps to Elliott and Western Aves. 6. For the Bypass Tunnel alt., provide optional connection to Elliott and Western Aves. 7. For the Aerial alt., do at-grade roadway on south end of project, except do aerial/tunnel ramps to SR 519, without traffic signals. 8. For the Surface alt., do at-grade roadway on south end of project, except do aerial/tunnel ramps to SR 519, without traffic signals. 9. Thanks for reading this far!

386

Comment

My comments are specifically regarding the central viaduct section of the project. It appears to me that most of the options put forward thus far are overblown and too costly. In my opinion all tunnel-based options should be shelved. I'd like to propose an alternative which I haven't seen yet, which I believe would cost less than most current options: put 99 on the surface and build a park over it. Better yet, build parking and retail/restaurant structures over it, and a park on top of that. It'd still be lower than the existing viaduct, and lower than the proposed aerial options. Park-goers would have phenomenal views, and the views from the city would be improved. Business within the structure would help offset the cost. Re-route surface streets and parking to accommodate 99, tear down the old viaduct, use the debris to make a new pier... Has anyone proposed anything like this? I've made a graphic that I'd like to submit. Thanks.

387

Comment

I think you should build the tunnel alternative. It may cost more but it opens up more land, it has higher speeds and less noise. It appears there is less of an construction impact, and overall the tunnel alternative will greatly enhance the beautification of the waterfront. I'm all for the tunnel alternative.

388

Comment

8 May 2004

Allison Ray
WSDOT Environmental Coordinator
Alaskan Way Viaduct and Seawall Project
999 Third Avenue, Suite 2424
Seattle, WA 98104

Dear Allison Ray:

Since we live in Burien we might have gone to Lafayette School in West Seattle, but that would have been farther than getting down to the Arctic Building, the Dome room no less where our wedding reception was held in 1948 when it was the Arctic Club. But we didn't even make that meeting, so I guess I have to write.

I have no sympathy for the people who have moved into office buildings or apartments that abut the viaduct. They knew if was there. I don't agree that it cuts anyone off; from 1st, 2nd, 3rd, 4th avenues one must be looking down a westerly street in order to see any of the harbor and its activity.

I remember when driving on the new viaduct one passed a lot of windows so dirty that no one could have seen anything out of them unless they were already broken, which many were. There were still railroad tracks crossing Alaskan Way out onto the docks, and traffic on Alaskan Way often was stopped by the switch engines and cars as they went out to the docks, so the viaduct was a very good choice at the time.

We depend on Highway 509 and the viaduct for quick access to downtown Seattle. When I see letters complaining about the viaduct and I look up the names in the telephone directory, I find that so often they live east of I-5 and north of the canal, or on Mercer Island, or east of the lake, or even just east of downtown. They never use the viaduct!

So what do I want? I do not want to be trapped in a tunnel during a Juan-de-Fuca plate seduction zone earthquake.

The options to rebuild or go aerial keep an important feature: surface parking in the waterfront area. Without that parking the current commercial development along Alaskan Way would not have happened nearly as soon as it did-if at all. A surface option would likely wipe out the parking.

So, yes I favor staying elevated.

Sincerely,

Jean Dougherty Whisler
121 S. 168th Street
Burien, WA 98148-1611

whislsmother@hotmail.com

389

Comment

I've been following the process of solving the problems with the Alaska Way Viaduct very closely. Would that all the money necessary were available. We could solve so many problems. The Mercer Way Mess could be solved while connecting I-5 directly with both SR-520 and Highway 99. The benefits to business interests would be immense. The Tunnel Alternative offers the greatest potential to the City of Seattle and its residents for redeveloping the front porch to the City while simultaneously providing more rapid and efficient movement of goods and people around both the City, the County and the Region. The savings anticipated through using the rebuilt seawall as a wall for the tunnel sweetens the project. Highway 99 is and most probably must remain a major highway of regional importance. It must someday connect fluidly with the other regional highways previously mentioned. Ideally, reconnection of city streets presently bisected by Highway 99/Aurora Avenue is also much to be desired. Provision should be made to eventually go for broke in this matter. Comprehensive planning designed to solve all of the problems should go forward post haste. The plans thus far presented are comprehensive. All that is lacking is the political will to say this must be done and it must be done now. We can be penny wise and pound foolish (as the City, County and State so often are) because so many of our citizens are locked into false memories of what yesterday was like. Rather than building for the future (for our posterity), all too many of our elected choose to pander to an elitist view that everything old must be preserved. Bullfrog!! Let's get on with making tomorrow, and tomorrow, and tomorrow better. That is what we should be about.

390

Comment

All of the property owners are going to have view property if this goes underground so talk to them instead of the taxpayers!!! The taxpayers can ante-up the cost of the rebuild and the property owners can come up with the other cost for building and getting it underground. Thanks for your time.

391

Comment

As a past resident of West Seattle and current resident of Ballard, I have come to use the SR99 viaduct as one of my prime driving routes. When I was in West Seattle, I rode the Metro bus on the viaduct to and from work each day. As much as I enjoy the view that the aerial structure provides, I support a tunnel-based solution to allow for the opportunity of a more pedestrian- and bike-friendly waterfront. Right now, the waterfront is marred by the sound of the cars, buses, and trucks on the viaduct.

Of the two tunnel alternatives, I prefer the Tunnel Alternative (as opposed to the Bypass TA) since it provides for greater volume of traffic on the final state route.

Thank you,

David

David F. W. Robison

3037 NW 72nd St.

Seattle, WA 98117-6266

392

Comment

I am in favor of the rebuild alternative because it will not increase traffic on Alaskan way once it is completed thereby NOT dividing the downtown from the waterfront any more than it already is. The other alternatives do increase traffic on Alaskan way, doubling and even quadrupling the traffic on the already crowded street and making it much more difficult for foot traffic to cross Alaskan way; but more importantly the noise and noxious fumes will make the waterfront experience much less desirable eventually driving people away.

393

Comment

Wish information on the complete project.

394

Comment

1) The DEIS does not adequately address the short term and long term traffic impacts that would result to residents living south of the Seattle CBD if the Tunnel, Bypass or Surface alternatives were constructed. All three of these alternatives eliminate the existing direct access at Seneca St and Columbia St - which would double the travel times for many commuters coming from places like West Seattle. These impacts to CBD access would occur both during construction and once the new facility is completed. They would affect both transit riders and drivers of cars. CBD employers and businesses would be affected by reduced access. Only the Rebuild and Aerial alternatives maintain the existing direct access to the CBD and those are the only two acceptable alternatives in my view. I realize the DEIS reports traffic analyses looking at travel times for the different alternatives. My comments on this is there has obviously been little high level oversight and thought put into the traffic analysis - hence there are faulty conclusions. The travel times in the analysis mostly look at "through" traffic - as if this was the only important factor. In my view, it is not. Travel times into and out of the LARGEST CBD IN THE REGION are as important, if not more important. The traffic impact analysis is flawed by putting the focus on through travel times vs. access to and from the CBD. If not corrected there will be a horrendous backlash from the public once the impacts materialize. Because the DEIS does not emphasize the impacts that will result from making access more difficult (for the Tunnel, Bypass or Surface alternatives) Seattle's mayor, Council, legislative representation and the state Transportation Commission membership don't seem to understand what they will be facing. Downtown business interests don't seem to either. The bottom line to my comment is that the EIS needs to be reissued with a more comprehensive and under stable presentation of traffic impacts affecting access into and out of the downtown CBD. These impacts need to be compared between the alternatives and traffic mitigation needs to be proposed (and included in the project cost estimates) for alternatives that eliminate direct access at Seneca and Columbia. The access analysis needs to look at both impacts during construction and after the facility is open. 2) From a financial standpoint, given the huge risk the region faces should the Viaduct be taken out of service due to further damage or continuing settlement, I think the Rebuild option is the only reasonable choice for a replacement alternative.

395

Comment

I have reviewed all of the options and feel this is the best option for addressing the traffic volumes. Additionally, the "Sound view" from the raised highway is a part of Seattle's unique skyline.

396

Comment

I strongly support the tunnel option. Though it is expensive, it will dramatically open up the waterfront. However, the space that results must not be sold off to developers to build view condos for the rich. If the public is footing the bill, it should reap the benefits in public space.

397

Comment

A. My order of preference is: 1- Bypass option with Northwest access via Alaskan Way, 2- Rebuild, 3- Bypass Alternative with Northwest access via Elliott and Western, 4-Aerial, 5-Tunnel option with Northwest access via Alaskan Way, 6- Tunnel Alternative with Northwest access via Elliott/Western, 7- Surface.
B. The City of Seattle should not grant a variance of the noise ordinance during evening and night in residential neighborhoods, such as Belltown.

398

Comment

I received a newsletter from my representative, Helen Sommers and am stunned to realize that several of the Viaduct Replacement options would eliminate the North Portal - meaning no access, entrance/exit to Magnolia, which is where I live. I received the newsletter too late to attend the public hearings, but HEAR ME NOW. No access to the viaduct is not acceptable. Rebuild the present structure or design a new aerial structure. Preserve our gorgeous driving views AND our access.

399

Comment

To Whom It May Concern:

My favorite choices for a Viaduct replacement are replacing the current structure or creating a new aerial structure. I am against the tunnel options because I think they would be very expensive and may have construction problems like sea water leakage, sink holes etc. that the above ground structures could avoid. Please send this note to the appropriate person/department. Thank you.

Sylvia Schweinberger

400

Comment

To Whom is May Concern:

I attended the last hearing about the viaduct/seawall project. As a long time Seattle resident and user of the viaduct, I have many concerns about the changes that are to happen in the future.

First of all, I feel the decisions have already been made and the hearings, etc. are just a front. In some areas of the city some of the major projects have been decided long before the public could voice concerns/questions. Even when the public votes something down the politicians make it happen anyway and we the public end up paying. Well, enough of that.

I would prefer rebuilding the viaduct or as a second choice the aerial approach. I use the viaduct as my main route to travel south/north, be it Georgetown, Burien, the airport, or I-5. I always enjoy the view from the viaduct no matter what the weather. I like the ability to travel through downtown without having to deal with all the stops and shops.

I fear being caught in a tunnel because of an accident or tie up of some sort without well thought out safety precautions. I object to the idea of developing more retail and living areas in the space of the current viaduct. Why is it necessary? The developers want the additional resources for their pockets. I don't believe the best interest of the people traveling the viaduct every day is paramount, if retail and living space is more important. We all know traffic along the waterfront now can be awful mess. Think of the impact without the viaduct. I-5 is not an option for those of us who live on the West Side of the city because it is already a nightmare.

In closing, I would prefer rebuilding the viaduct and the sooner the better. Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

Sandra Haug

401

Comment

To whom it may concern,

We have been downtown residence for over 20 years and live on First Ave.. in the Watermark Tower. We love our neighborhood and the water front. The noise from the viaduct is not overbearing, but constant. A tunnel would help eliminate the noise and allow the Waterfront to become a better attraction for tourists and the people of Seattle, but why do we need a tunnel? Shouldn't we spend the money on mass transit and let the people that need to drive north and south to find another way or drive thru downtown? Downtown could use the traffic and the business. This might encourage more people to move to the city or closer to work. Every day we see the same people that work up north using the viaduct to get from their homes in the south and the watch their return in the evening and the people that work down south drive from their homes up north and turn around and use the viaduct to get back home after work. Obviously, I will never understand their thinking.

If we must express automobiles down 99 and bypass the city I still believe the tunnel is best. I believe the trolley is important to the Waterfront and to Pike Place Market. I would turn the trolley up First Ave. where it crosses First Ave. in Pioneer Square now and then again west at Yeller to Western. Up Western to University and put a "Y" that would continue up Western to the Market, but would a University branch off to the Waterfront and run to the present Trolley barn.

Portland is a prime example of waterfront utilization. Do you remember when the space on the west side of the river that is now a park was a freeway in Portland? Our waterfront could be 100 times better with a more logical planning. But who cares? Right?

Darwin M. Smith

402

Comment

Dear Mayor Nickels: I truly appreciate your leadership so far. I am especially proud (and kind of astonished) at your position on recognizing gay marriages. That is very gutsy on your behalf, and a lot of us truly appreciate it!!!! I hope you and Ron Simms will continue to stick up for what's right. The reason I am writing, however, is the subject of the viaduct. This is Seattle's chance to get rid of a potentially deadly eyesore. Let's get rid of that thing all together. Put it underground, or some other alternative. We need to lobby the federal government big time for funding. This thing should be underground so we can enjoy Seattle's beautiful waterfront. Right now, it (the viaduct) just dissects downtown from the water. I would love to see beautiful waterfront parks, instead. Hope you will seriously consider this. Your friend and supporter, Ron Wittcock

403

Comment

Dear Mayor Nichols,

I am a Seattle business owner and a very proud resident of Seattle. I hope we can both be proud of the Seattle we will leave to our children. Please don't waste time and money rebuilding the aging and flawed viaduct. It's a complete waste and a political sinkhole. I urge you to work toward the inclusion of a "no-highway" alternative in the Viaduct EIS Regards, Dave Brede

404

Comment

Subject - Comment on Alaskan Way Replacement DEIS

Dear Ms Ray,

I've watched the development of this project with growing concern. The project as presented in the DEIS proposes to replace the Alaskan Way Viaduct with one or another alternative at a cost of some \$4 billion. And what will we have at the end?? Alaskan Way with roughly the capacity it had before the project started. Net benefit? Almost zero!

And for this, the project will sop up all the available funding for transportation projects for years to come. This has to be the worst deal for the public ever in Washington history. So how did we get there??

My belief is that the fundamental mistake was to assume that the project needed to accommodate all the demand. There was insufficient study of what might happen if the demand wasn't met. After all, it is the existence of Alaskan Way that has enabled the demand to grow. If you provided more capacity, you'd get even more traffic. And, more significantly, if you provided less capacity, you'd get less traffic. This will probably be demonstrated during construction. What happened to the thousands of cars that want to drive over the bridge to Bremerton? They don't, because the bridge wasn't built!

This is the age of limited resources, of concern for sustainable living, including transportation. The funds that will be squandered on Alaskan Way could provide far more transportation capacity if they were spent on sustainable alternatives, such as demand management, non-motorized transportation, transit, and a limited capacity boulevard along the waterfront. (As in San Francisco, or Portland)

I sincerely hope that the fundamental wisdom of this proposal is questioned, and that ultimately the community demands a replacement for the viaduct more in keeping with the needs of the times. We don't need another "Big Dig".

Sincerely,

Gerald Fox

405

Comment

I strongly recommend that the State considers an additional surface option for the DEIS. The cut and cover option, while the most effective in responding to the long term growth potential of the waterfront, falls short in not providing a lid between Pike and Battery. Especially considering that Pike and Steinbreuck Park are the heart of our City.

The most effective solution for the long term health of downtown Seattle and the region is the one that takes the most courage for WSDOT to consider - no net increase in roadway on Alaskan Way and solving traffic by improving I-5 intersections and dispersal through the downtown.

Connecting to our waterfront is an economic development driver. Ten years from now no one will remember the hassle it was to add another option to the DEIS but Seattle will be infinitely farther on it's way to providing economic and quality of life value for the region.

(These comments represent my personal viewpoint and do not represent any organization I am affiliated with. I have been an active participant in the City Design waterfront charrette and Downtown Seattle Association Viaduct Committee)
Deb Guenther, ASLA, LEED™AP

2562 7th Avenue, W

Seattle, WA 98119

206-286-0101

406

Comment

The best alternative is to place the roadway underground. Build the tunnel. Everything else is a compromise. I am sick of Seattle transportation projects that attempt to: A. Satisfy everyone; and B. Spend as little money as possible. First of all, you will never satisfy everyone. Make the best decision for the city, stop looking at stupid polls, and move ahead. Secondly, any decent proposal will cost a lot of money. The real question is what will the expenditure buy? If the answer is limited to roadways, then the money is not well spent. If the answer is roadways, quiet waterfront, new potential sites for development, an expanded tax base, new pedestrian open space, then the money is worth it. This can be an enduring legacy: Fifty years from now, no-one will care what it cost.

407

Comment

I'm in favor of a limited-lane surface road alternative because it best meets the needs of the area in question: the waterfront. A rebuild or tunnel addresses the question of how to get through Seattle without dealing with the I-5 bottleneck, which has nothing to do with the waterfront, its relationship to the city, and how its integration with the city might become more fruitful for all concerned. Given that the disruption to the current traffic pattern is inevitable and long-term, we don't need to consider "replacing" the current traffic pattern with this proposal. It will obviously have to go somewhere during construction, and our efforts might be better spent managing where else traffic will go, and planning capacity extension along multiple avenues. You only have to visit the Embarcadero in San Francisco to see how successful a surface road alternative can be at satisfying the needs of various transportation constituencies without looking like a multi-lane freeway. Restricted-speed surface roads allow for into-city transport of freight, tourist traffic, and local circulation. They quite helpfully deter anyone looking for a speedy shortcut through the city, and create a calmer traffic pattern. They are easily integrated with our existing public transit system, and may even allow the expansion of the Waterfront Streetcar Line. Most importantly, they don't challenge current transportation behavior in inviting a waterfront experience rather than helping you bypass it entirely. The question of where existing traffic will go (and the larger question of how to get through or past Seattle) is really a separate issue, though a burning question in its own right. But let's try to solve that question by asking if it was ever a good idea to create a major secondary route through the heart of the city? There are a nexus of constituencies that were being served sub optimally by the existing structure. But it's not necessary to serve them all through a single replacement structure, and probably is not advisable. The city is planning at great expense to link parts of the city by light rail and (god forbid) Monorail; hopefully the city is considering the fact that public transit might serve a greater need than anticipated. Freight traffic to and from the waterfront belongs on freeways and again, rail options might prove a viable alternative. What it comes down to is making a choice about which question you want to solve: that of the region's transportation issues (which is not solvable with any single structure), or how to help residents live in their city?

408

Comment

City, county, state government:

The cut-and-cover tunnel alternative is the best option

There should be no net increase in roadway to Alaskan Way
Any additional traffic on the surface should be dispersed among all avenues running through the downtown corridor

The lid over SR 99 should extend from Pike to Battery

Kathleen Rabel
resident and business owner in downtown Seattle, Pike Market area
Washington Pioneer family

Comment

Dear Ms. Ray and the Alaskan Way Viaduct and Seawall Replacement Project:

About three weeks ago, I attended one of the Draft EIS review meetings (at Leif Erickson Lodge, in Ballard). Thank you for your work thus far on this difficult and contentious project. I apologize for the delay in my response.

Let me preface my opinions by stating that I grew up in West Seattle and lived there for over 40 years; currently I live in Ballard and still use the viaduct rather than I-5 almost without exception. The viaduct is as important a lifeline for West Seattle as the West Seattle Bridge. I have both traveled through downtown and commuted to it.

- 1) Note: I did not spend much time looking at construction mitigation, as I believe the final result is the primary concern, whatever the pain required to get there.
- 2) Please don't underbuild; eliminate the Bypass Tunnel and Surface Alternatives. Though I wish the need for automobiles would diminish or even disappear, neither will happen in the foreseeable future. Capacity is strained with the present three lanes each direction, so down-sizing to two lanes each way is not viable.
- 3) Eliminate the Aerial Alternative. Given the current strong objection to the existing viaduct, I believe there would be tremendous outrage at building a larger and even more ominous structure (even if the supports are farther apart). I had a friend who was killed when the motorcycle he was riding was pushed over the side of the viaduct by a truck changing lanes, so I am painfully aware of the existing viaducts safety shortcomings. Though not as thoroughly as the Aerial Alternative, the Rebuild Alternative does provide partial shoulders, and significantly addresses safety issues.
- 4) That leaves the choice between the Tunnel and Rebuild Alternatives, unfortunately the two most expensive, but the Rebuild Alternative could be done as a complete tear-down, making it less expensive than the Aerial Alternative.
 - a. Rebuild Alternative and Seawall Replacement Projects: These two major projects could be done independently, so any delays in the seawall projects need not interrupt progress on the viaduct. The combined effort might take longer than the tunnel, but if done as a complete tear-down, the viaduct itself might be rebuilt relatively quickly and more cheaply than the Aerial Alternative. However, federal funds might only be provided for the highway project and not for the seawall.

From a practical point of view and for non-downtown residents, this alternative makes the most sense:

- Maintains best traffic flow by keeping downtown exit and entrance ramps.
- Maintains public parking for sports events, concerts. Shopping, business, and tourists.
- Least expensive viable alternative (if done as a tear-down).
- Probably shortest interruption of highway traffic flow for construction.
- Maintains the most pleasant and scenic highway section in the city.
- Find extra money and the imagination to give it architectural interest; make it a feature of the city (like the original, now sunk, floating bridge one was) instead of a blight on it.
- Add a no-pedestrian bikeway to the structure. This would improve the safety, speed, and viability of bicycle commuting to, from, and through downtown.
- b. Tunnel Project (with Integral Seawall): This is a single larger project, with more chance for delays (for the highway), however integral use of the seawall as part of the tunnel structure provides some economy in overall cost and schedule, which may prove to be greater than anticipated. Most or all of the seawall could probably be built prior to demolition of the viaduct, limiting likelihood of delays once highway flow is interrupted. Also, since the seawall is integral to the highway, federal funds might be provided for a greater percentage of the overall cost.

From the point of view of downtown livability and aesthetics this alternative makes the most sense:

- Maintains most of the current traffic flow capability and convenience.
- Overall cost may be lower than anticipated (especially for Washington residents).
- Overall project might be completed faster, minimizing waterfront impacts.
- Greatly improved downtown environment for pedestrians, workers, tourists, and residents.
- Improved aesthetics of downtown from other areas and views from downtown.
- Addition of desirable waterfront area greenspace.
- Opportunity for a mini, bicycles-only viaduct. (If the tunnel requires towers to get exhaust fumes above street level, they could be used for some of the supports.)
- Note: A friend expressed some fear of tunnels but indicated that natural light filtering through the ventilation grating in the Battery Street Tunnel makes it more bearable.

Recommendations:

Provisos (whatever the final choice):

- At least 75% of public (on street) parking beneath the existing viaduct is returned to public parking.
- Space occupied by the existing viaduct should be kept as public property.

This is a very tough call, and I don't yet have an absolute choice.

The Rebuild Alternative makes good sense. It would provide travelers stunning views and make city life most pleasant for thousands of non-downtown residents. Build it as a complete tear-down, and use those saving toward adding an integral bikeway and making it an architecturally interesting feature of the city. The Golden Gate Bridge,

the Brooklyn Bridge, and the original Lake Washington Floating Bridge (now sunk) are examples of structures that make a city proud, not remorseful.

For the city as a whole, the Tunnel Alternative may be the right thing to do? The actual cost for residents could be less than for a viaduct. However, you are underestimating the value and need for mid-downtown entrance and exit ramps. Work them into the project, or at least make provisions for later addition. Also, seriously consider the bicycles only viaduct idea as a follow-on project while placing and sizing ventilation towers.

410

Comment

For the record--please consider asking the feds to include a new Interstate loop--maybe I-305--as part of any new viaduct--520 connector--Mercer mess solution--West Seattle bridge--Spokane Street--Seattle by-pass. Sincerely, Alan H. Deright--30--.

411

Comment

In Alaskan Way Viaduct Draft EIS, I believe that the Best alternatives will be the Re-build or the new Aerial.

I also believe two of the three of the Alternatives are NOT feasible. The all surface Boulevard would be a rush hour nightmare for commuters, business and industry traffic.

The four lane tunnel would eliminate the north portal which is access from Elliott Ave. and exit to Western Ave. and therefore, be closed to all traffic to or from the Regrade, Magnolia, Queen Anne, Interbay, Ballard and further north, including industry along the canal. The six-lane tunnel shows the north portal as an option, not included in the basic design and cost the most.

I believe only the Aerial or Re-build has the same capacity as the present Viaduct. Capacity should be reduced, as this will further gridlock I-5 even more.

The removal of the viaduct for development will gridlock the city in the name of transportation. Federal and State funds should not be used in this unfair process to fatten politician's and developers wallets. It should be noted that Seattle ranks in the highest for gridlock of all major cities in the USA. The value of the viaduct corridor is worth billions to the people of Washington State.

The EIS process WHO WILL DECIDE WHAT WILL REPLACE THE VIADUCT...has been compromised to the point of CORRUPTION.

1. The draft regional transportation package as reported in the Seattle Times twice, on January 22, 2004, "Alaskan Way Viaduct: \$1.1 billion, mostly to replace viaduct south of King St. with surface roadway".....April 30th 2004 has "\$1billion dollars for the Alaskan Way Viaduct. The viaduct will be replaced between Holgate and South King Street with surface road."

2 Mayor Greg Nickels has publicly promoted the development of Seattle Waterfront without an Alaskan Way Viaduct. Mayor Greg Nickels shows his bias and should be removed from the decisions of the Alaskan Way Viaduct alternatives process.

3. The EIS comment period is not complete until the first of June 2004. We believe this pre-determination on the viaduct future is a violation of the rules of law and should have a federal investigation.

412

Comment

That the City of Seattle work DOT to relocate CASA Latina Day workers' center to a suitable location. We are asking that you give us this support.

That this DOT give priority to construction companies that include in their bids a commitment to working with CASA Latina to employ our workers in the construction.

413

Comment

That the DOT of Seattle work to construction companies that include in their bids a commitment to working with CASA Latina to employ our workers in the construction.

414

Comment

The project will impact the people who live near the viaduct that are disproportionately poor and Latino. The CASA Latina day laborers who seek for job in that area would need help in two ways:

- The City of Seattle should work with the DOT and CASA Latina Day workers center to relocate them to a suitable location.
- The DOT should give priority to construction companies that include in their bids a commitment to working with CASA Latina to employ their workers in the construction.

415

Comment

The Tunnel Alternative is the most forward-thinking alternative. Let's remedy the greed and stupidity of our tax-paying predecessors. (They've all retired to the peace of the San Juans after selling us their run-down houses for exorbitant prices.) The Tunnel reduces noise and puts the most traffic underground. It also creates the most open space on the central waterfront. Boo-hoo-hoo for the drivers and passengers who would not have views of downtown, Elliott Bay, and the Olympic Mountains. They can get out of their vehicles and enjoy a park with other human beings on foot. We all needed the exercise, last time I checked.

416

Comment

The project will impact the people who live near the viaduct, who are disproportionately poor and Latino. In all of the 5 alternatives, the CASA Latina Workers Center will be displaced and the livelihood of these 1000 day laborers will be affected. I understand that they need to move but I would like to ask the DOT to help them in two ways:

1. The City of Seattle with DOT, work with CASA Latina to relocate the Day Workers' Center to a suitable location.

417

Comment

I am concerned about the effect of the proposed project alternatives on Belltown day laborers. I would like to see CASA Latina and Millionaire Club workers employed in the project and would like to see CASA Latina ensured a favorable relocation close to arterial, highway access and the downtown core (free ride zone).

Comment

Why is there so much moaning and groaning about waterfront ideas with a tunnel or cover and six lanes or eight? Last year Roger Patten AIA wrote an op-ed article in the Seattle Times proposing a bridge across Elliot Bay to replace the viaduct. It would go from the battery street tunnel to south of town and join somewhere near the stadiums. He estimates it would cost about a billion dollars. Why has this proposal been met with silence?

Tunnels are not popular with people that have to use them. The Chunnel that connects Britain with Europe is barely maintaining because people prefer to use the ferries where they can be on the water not under it, and they can see the scenery and smell the fresh air.

The big dig in Boston came in billions of dollars over budget, and the same thing could happen here. In fact Sound Transit tunnel's bid came in millions over the amount estimated and they haven't even turned one shovel of dirt.

In case you haven't seen Roger's proposal I'm enclosing a copy. As an arts organization you should be able to see the beauty of a soaring bridge over the bay that frames the Olympic Mountains, removes traffic and its noise from downtown and gives the waterfront room for parks and promenades.

If you have any knowledge of why consideration of a bridge is denied, I'd be interested to know. A less expensive alternative by far to the current proposals merits at least an explanation of why not.

Clare O'Regan
mcgoregan@aol.com

Proposed Elliot Bay Bridge by Roger Patten AIA

Imagine a bridge built over Elliot Bay that removes the high speed traffic and noise of highway 99 away from the waterfront and returns the waterfront back to the city of Seattle for development.

Picture a cable-stayed suspension bridge with a main span of 3,450 feet for a total bridge length of 6,900 feet with approaches for a total length of two miles. It can be built within five years at a cost of about one billion dollars. The bridge would be the same length as the Alaskan Way Viaduct and replace it forever.

The bridge's main span is supported by two bridge towers that are approximately 1000 feet above sea level and support the cable stayed bridge span 240 feet above the water.

The towers will have Viewing/Restaurant platforms at the 800 foot level for the south tower and Security facilities for the Port of Seattle and US Coast Guard at the north tower.

The bridge deck has a curve designed into it to allow for expansion and contraction of the superstructure between the approaches and will curve outward from the waterfront to afford a greater space for Seattle to have an Inner Harbor. This curved deck will also move the highway traffic a half mile off the waterfront, far enough away so you can see the vitality of the traffic but not hear it,

The curve in the bridge deck will also allow for the bridge alignment with the Battery Street Tunnel and when traveling north on the bridge the Space Needle will appear centered between the suspension cables and when traveling south (on a good day), Mt. Rainier will appear centered between the suspension cables.

The Bridge is designed to support six lanes of car/truck traffic and two monorail tracks under the bridge superstructure for a personal rapid transit (PRT) public monorail transportation service to the bridge towers and the city's new waterfront development.

The bridge towers will be mirror like and at times their silhouettes will disappear and reappear like a mirage with reflections and shadows in the waters of Elliott Bay.

The bridge cable-stayed suspension system is a new and inventive structure and is supported by the two towers anchored approximately 220 feet below the surface of the water by means of a foundation system that will harness the unique geology of the Elliott Bay estuary and resolves the ecological impact of the bridge construction in a new and meaningful way.

The Elliott Bay Bridge will be the longest cable stayed bridge in the world and perhaps a new signature for the City of Seattle.

Some engineers believe the Alaskan Way Viaduct is too dangerous to use and should be shut down. Remember the California Northridge Earthquake of January 17, 1994 and the catastrophic events to the transportation system of L.A.

Now is the time to build!

419

Comment

May 22, 2004

Alaskan Way Viaduct and Seawall Replacement Project c/o WSDOT
999 Third Avenue, Suite 2424
Seattle, WA 98104

Citizen Comment:

I think that the present Viaduct is the best thing we have in our transportation system in Seattle. It allows traffic from the North end (Greenwood – Holman Road – Ballard district, Highway 99 (Aurora Avenue) to connect directly to the South end industrial area for truck traffic and a swift uninterrupted connection to West Seattle (Magnolia to California Avenue in 20 minutes) and on to the airport via Burien as the quickest route from the North end to the airport – all this freedom of movement without having to use the I-5 freeway. This route should never be tampered with. It is a result of many years of traffic engineering study for this North – South traffic corridor.

Some older more experienced engineers have stated that the viaduct has many more years of useful life. It is not the same design as the San Francisco double decker viaduct that collapsed in the 6.0 plus earthquake. The Seattle Viaduct is designed so that it will not pancake in an earthquake.

In these times of high taxes it would be prudent of the city to consult with structural engineers to determine what type of retrofitting could be done to add more strength to the existing structure. They need to lay out plans to repair any aging cracks, repair the roadbed and shore up areas that are settling and give it a good pressure washing to clean it and brighten it. This would be the most practical solution to extend its life and to save us taxpayers the huge burden of replacement. And it would be much less of an impact on the transportation corridors. It would be much less of an impact on our waterfront tourist businesses and businesses throughout the city.

All of the five options for replacing the Viaduct will cause many years of clogged traffic and misery on our city streets. I hope that the decisions that are made regarding the Viaduct will not be politically driven yielding to pressures from our powerful developers who want to profit from the pocketbooks of the unsuspecting and underrepresented taxpayer.

Yours truly,

S.J. Holmes

420

Comment

I prefer and support the vision of the viaduct as a car-free park! A boardwalk that would rival any in the world with a world class view. Dig a pay-tunnel underneath or better yet a bridge out in the harbor but please no Cut and cover tunnels or 8 lane waterfront solutions!
Billy King

421

Comment

Hello Seattle City and King County Council members,

Thanks for all you do for the citizens of Seattle and King County.

I just wanted to make a quick e-appeal to all of you respecting the proposed replacement of the Alaskan Way viaduct. It seems our viaduct problem also presents us with a unique opportunity to give our Seattle waterfront a rejuvenating facelift.

I envision a vibrant, revitalized waterfront, without that cement, double-decker eye-sore; I see a waterfront with less car traffic and more pedestrian and bicycle traffic, connecting downtown neighborhoods with Pike Place Market, Steinbrueck and Myrtle Edwards Parks.

[I bike from downtown (Western and Spring) to Magnolia via Alaskan Way and Myrtle Edwards bike trail at least twice a week, and would sorely grieve were that waterfront route to be swallowed up, or even compromised, by a major highway system along that corridor.]

It's a lovely vision, but also--I realize--an expensive one. A tunnel alternative seems the ideal solution from the aesthetic and livability perspectives. The question, I suppose, is whether a tunnel is economically feasible. I sure hope so.

Thanks for your time and attention,

-R. Thatcher

422

Comment

Re: Draft EIS for the Options Involving Viaduct

Dear Ladies and Gentlemen:

There is so much good material in the draft EIS on the various possible ways to deal with the certainty that the viaduct must be replaced. I will eschew rehashing the detail of the report and stick to the big picture.

The most important thing to recognize, I feel, is that the way the viaduct is dealt with can and should be the defining moment for the "boomer" generation that is at its crest and soon to be on the way gradually to retirement. (While all generations will be involved with this decision, I say this because we currently represent the largest age cohort). We've enjoyed the benefits of those who came before us and created Arboretums and lovely University of Washington campus vistas, cleaned up Lake Washington waters, created the Seattle Center, and many other items in our built infrastructure too numerous to mention. Our generation has built a lot of office towers and shopping centers, condos and sports stadiums, but nothing that by itself seems to count as a true legacy to future generations. We are running out of time to do so.

It is not overstating it to say, I believe, that at least one of the viaduct "fixes" can transform the very way Seattle sees itself and is perceived by others. That relates to the fact that even though we are a seaport and our Emerald City fronts the shores of Puget Sound, our waterfront is largely an embarrassment, someplace we hide our visitors from instead of making sure they see it. If we can find a way to go with the "Cut and cover tunnel" alternative, we have the opportunity to create a true heart to the city, a place where people live, shop, recreate and where there is enough space to call it a civic space. This new place will connect the heart of the urban downtown with the soft edge of the water. All great seaports find a way to do this.

I hope the 'cut and cover' alternative can be modified a bit to cut down the number of lanes of traffic that will still seem to dominate Alaskan Way. Can't a portion of the flow be diverted to other streets in the north south grid? And we should make sure the tunnel is long enough that we create a truly worthwhile space, not some Westlake "Park" postage stamp chump space.

The key things here are to not let our suffocating "process" bog us down till the damn viaduct falls down, and the other is to decide at the beginning that while for many items we need to be very cost sensitive, in this case we have to realize that there is a difficult to quantify (but very real) upside that will accrue to creating a truly vibrant, beautiful heart to our city that will pay dividends 100's of times over the course of time. Yes, it will be difficult to find the money, but all involved must be passionately steadfast in adhering to the vision that this is something we HAVE to figure out and make happen. Naysayers turned down 90% Federal financing for an underground Metro for the region, and crushed the opportunity for us to have a beautiful city sized park at The Commons, why not this time see the yea sayers have their day??

Cut and Cover Tunnel is the way to go. The new space created will have the potential to make Seattle a much more special place to live. The new library is an inspiration, if we can create this space the way it should, it can have 50 times the impact the dazzling new library will have on our lives and for the lives of those who will follow us.

Kerry Nicholson

423

Comment

Please tear down the viaduct. The alternatives mentioned (tunnel) are far better than an above ground replacement. Complete removal of highway 99 is better than the alternatives mentioned in this report. We have way too many roads as it is in this city. Please move forward with a more pedestrian, bike, tourist and environmentally friendly alternative. Imagine....the seafront opened up to the city!

424

Comment

The Tunnel Alternative would NEVER be built IF it had to be fully paid for by LOCAL TAXPAYERS. In such event the focus would be on finding methods to repair and maintain the Alaska Way Viaduct. Is this not true? "Free money" results in flawed decisions detrimental to all American citizens. This project fits that mold PERFECTLY. We need to focus on the repairing and maintaining the Viaduct as it now exists. It has served the community well for 540+ years, and it can (IF PROPERLY MAINTAINED) serve another 50 years.

425

Comment

My main concern is that the alternative selected for the project will be the one that will create the least traffic rerouting while the work is in progress. We have experienced the increased traffic congestion on I-5 when the viaduct is closed for just a short period of time. I am in favor of rebuilding the viaduct as it now exists if that can be done with little or no rerouting of traffic. I was born and raised in Seattle, and I have never considered the viaduct an eyesore. It is as much a part of our picturesque skyline as the rest of our structures. Thanks, Howard A. Monta

426

Comment

When making a decision on the alternatives, please do some site visits to other waterfront cities. I have not visited many, but one in particular - San Francisco - seems to be an ideal situation. The area is free from loud freeway noise, it's a pleasant and peaceful place for anybody to spend time. It's a great place to go for a bike ride or a run. There are trees, grass, and plenty of open space to enjoy. Can you imagine that waterfront with an overhead freeway? Or, what would it be like with a 6-lane surface freeway? Either situation would completely ruin the ambiance of that area. I often spend time on the Seattle waterfront and currently it's not a pleasant place to spend time due to the noise from the viaduct. I hope the decision is made to bury the traffic. Even if it costs more than a surface or elevated road, the decision to transform the waterfront into a peaceful location will be a major asset to the city in the years to come.

427

Comment

I do not see anything in the EIS that addresses the option of not rebuilding the viaduct and the mitigation of traffic congestion by the construction of the monorail from Ballard to West Seattle. Also the EIS does not adequately address the economic impact on retail business and residential homeowners during the long construction times as well as the effects of the increased traffic(as much as 4x the present volume on Alaskan way) will have on business and home values. Any alternative that would decrease traffic on Alaskan way would certainly enhance the attractiveness of the waterfront to bikers and pedestrians alike, as well integrating the downtown with the waterfront without the high traffic volumes that would turn Alaskan way into another I-5 with endless streams of traffic.

428

Comment

I think the aerial alternative is best - first choice - fits the traveling needs best and allows auto traffic to see the best drive in town.

Comment

With the unquestionable need now to replace the Viaduct, I think we have been handed an opportunity to deal once-and-for-all with a problem that has been long discussed in Seattle. Many citizens, business owners and people involved in Seattle's economic development have wanted for years to get rid of the blight created by the Viaduct. Now we have the opportunity to do that for very little cost. Why do I say "little cost"? Since the Viaduct MUST be replaced no matter what, the cost of finally getting rid of it for good is only the difference between the replacement cost and the tunnel cost. The difference in price between one option and the other is a small price to pay for the enormous economic and social benefits created in accomplishing what many have sought for years.

One thing mentioned a couple of times in the Environmental Impact Statement for Viaduct replacement is the trade-off of views for drivers v. views for people living, working, and shopping downtown and tourists on the waterfront. In my opinion, people who are driving shouldn't be distracted by spectacular views anyway, especially when traveling at sixty miles per hour on an ELEVATED roadway.

As the EIS points out, removing the Viaduct completely opens expansive views for all the people who live and work downtown at or below the viaduct level. What isn't mentioned is that it also IMPROVES the QUALITY of the existing view for all who live or work ABOVE the Viaduct and look down on that area. So EVERYONE downtown benefits by putting the route underground. Also not mentioned in the EIS is the important fact that the tunnel options open up the view BACK toward the city FROM the waterfront for all the tourists on the waterfront and tourists entering the city by boat and ship. That's a LOT to be gained for the sake of what drivers lose who should be paying attention to the road and not the view anyway. And it's LOT to be gained for the difference in price between rebuilding the viaduct and building a tunnel.

As the EIS mentions, the tunnel options also greatly dampen the horrendous noise across the entire face of our town. Who wants to hear roaring traffic while they're enjoying our city's primary tourist attraction -- its waterfront -- or what COULD BE its primary tourist attraction. What's more important? A spectacular view for those who are on the Viaduct for all of five minutes at 60mph ... or the view plus freedom from noise for those who look at the view for several hours many days a week? Would it make more sense to save the view for people who shouldn't be looking while depriving all of those who should???

One political/economic argument that has been raised against the Viaduct is that fuel trucks will not be able to travel through a tunnel. To the best of my knowledge that is the only negative traffic impact of the six-lane tunnel. In fifteen years of traveling the viaduct, I don't think I've ever seen a fuel truck. So, they can't represent a ignorant traffic factor. I would also point out that putting fuel trucks twenty feet above the ground at sixty miles an hour is as questionable from a safety point of view as running them through a tunnel. Perhaps its time for the Seattle Fire Department to consider the risk of a fuel truck careening over the rails and throwing its fuel all over the streets below. (I would suggest the potential danger that already exists on the Viaduct is every bit as great as the risk of a spill and fire inside the tunnel. In other words, opening the tunnel to flammables is no worse than what is already allowed.

In fact, the tunnel can probably be engineered in such a way as to make such a spill much less of a risk than in an elevated situation that sprays

fire down on the populace below -- by containing the fire.)

In terms of economic impact, if fuel trucks have to be rerouted via I-5, there is no fishing fleet nor any pleasure boats on the downtown waterfront, so there would be no impact to the maritime industry along the waterfront. Any maritime fuel needs along the downtown waterfront are already handled by the surface roads anyway because you can't drive a fuel truck off of the existing Viaduct to service the downtown maritime industry. So, there is no maritime impact.

Delivering oil between the Ballard Interbay area and the Duwammish or West Seattle via I-5 would only add four extra miles. All the needs of downtown ought not to be held hostage to that minor increase in delivery costs. That's a tiny economic impact compared to the unmeasured negative economic impact that already exists with the raised Viaduct. Removing the viaduct will remove an enormous EXISTING negative impact that has never fully been measured. Removing the Viaduct would result in a huge economic boon for all of downtown.

If the state is going to stretch beyond its approximate \$2M fundraising capacity for this project, then it should stretch as far as possible and enable Seattle to do a major project in the most forward-thinking way, not the most immediately expedient way. The enormous economic and social benefits of putting ALL current Viaduct traffic underground -- the big tunnel -- is an absolute bargain, given that the difference in cost between building the aerial option and the tunnel is only half a billion dollars.

I also want to point out that expanding the existing aerial by twenty feet, as proposed, makes the Viaduct bigger and uglier than ever. Many people already hate the imposing shadow of the existing viaduct and the dank, dirty area underneath, and an expanded aerial only makes the current problem WORSE. Now is the only opportunity we'll ever have at putting the entire blight of the Viaduct underground. To miss this opportunity for the sake of immediate financial considerations would be the biggest political short-sightedness in a long, long time.

The economic cost to the City of Seattle over the next hundred years that is imposed even by the existing Viaduct is almost incalculable. By comparison the cost of the big tunnel (with all the ramp options for serving Ballard and Interbay) is calculable and a bargain.

Do it right. Pick the Cadillac option that will forever improve the City of Seattle. In the process, don't add ANY new lanes of traffic to the surface. Keep that area for parking and for park space. (Ideally, you should even add underground parking for the waterfront in order to get the automobile as far out of the PICTURE as possible.) This will be the single greatest improvement to City of Seattle since the World's Fair. And wasn't the World's Fair all about Seattle being the Transportation City of the future? Let's live up to the promise of the World's Fair and think for the future. Don't allow immediate financial constraints to hobble the city's future forever. The only cost of the tunnel now is the difference in price between that option and the replacement option.

Successfully advocating the tunnel and seeing it through could be your great legacy for the City of Seattle. I know that the forward thinking leadership I see exhibited on both the tunnel and the monorail will be a

decisive factor in my own voting. I want to see visionary leaders that can carry great ideas forward, rather than small-minded leaders who can see only the obstacles. (I'm not suggesting you are in the latter category because I don't know your position on the tunnel or the monorail; but these are two big forward-thinking ideas for Seattle that make real the transportation dreams expressed by the World's Fair.)

--David Haggith

430

Comment

When the tunnel concepts were announced, my initial reaction was against any such concept. First, the high cost was a big problem for me; second, the elevated route through the city generally works and provides magnificent city/water views for commuters & visitors. Nothing has changed my mind since. In fact, I'm confused about the significantly lowered cost estimate for the full tunnel option - perhaps this is due to a shorter tunnel? I'm very dubious about the "re-attach Seattle to the waterfront" benefit that has been used to advance the cause of a tunnel. While the varying schemes for the public space are somewhat intriguing, the largest benefit seems to accrue to the owners of real estate east of the right-of-way. Since tax-increment financing is illegal in our state, I'd like to see some sort of direct investment by these land owners, since their property values will increase dramatically. Another concern I have is the lack of provision (it appears) for any sort of fixed mass transit along this route. Whether or not such a system can every get approved, it would seem prudent to build a replacement to the viaduct that would at least support such an opportunity (e.g., light rail/monorail for several miles n/s along the corridor). My preferences, then, in descending order: 1. Rebuild alternative 2. Aerial alternative 3. Bypass tunnel alternative 4. Tunnel alternative 5. Surface alternative Despite the higher cost of the tunnels, I believe they are better than trying to shoe horn huge traffic volumes onto a surface-only replacement. One of the biggest issues related to the surface systems is that they don't really address bypass or through traffic, which is a large percentage of total vehicle travel. The types of signaling or ped overpasses needed to maintain a high n-s traffic flow would, I think, largely undermine any visual benefit of removing the structure - you'd still have a "wall of traffic" separating the city from the waterfront.

431

Comment

I agree that something must be done. Not only does this roadway benefit me directly for my commute but the corridor is essential for the region. However, I believe that we don't have to spend billions of dollars to recreate or emulate the existing structure. Let's learn from San Francisco where they did not replace a similar structure with similar needs. They have managed very well at changing the environment in a positive manner and using alternative means for transportation movement along that corridor. For the livability of the city as well as making the waterfront a truly attractive environment, a place to proudly visit with friends and tourists, I do not believe the viaduct should be replaced. The economic benefits would be tremendous for both the tourist industry and for real estate values. However, in order to keep traffic moving without the viaduct, improve access to/from I-5. By fixing the existing problems in the area of I-5 & Spokane St turning the waterfront into a truly attractive environment, the city will benefit tremendously with better traffic flow on I-5 and creation of a valuable asset along the waterfront. I use the viaduct daily and would certainly miss it. But the alternatives are much better for the city and region as a whole. Rebuild the seawall, replace the viaduct with a simple, beautifully designed boulevard that discourages north/south through travel and fix the I-5 access instead. Let's quit thinking we have to have what exist today and be willing to be creative and alter our travel patterns by learning from the wonderful work that San Francisco has done by not replacing their vital viaduct. In conclusion, rebuild the seawall but not the viaduct but build a surface structure that is not a main north/south highway. Along with these changes, there will be an economic shot in the arm along the waterfront and surrounding CBD area with a truly attractive destination.

432

Comment

As a Magnolia resident, the surface street and bypass tunnel options are unacceptable. In the "Why do we need the project?" section of the EIS it states, "the Alaskan Way Viaduct serves as a vital route for drivers, transit providers and riders, and the freight community by linking several key areas, including Burien, West Seattle, Duwamish industrial area, downtown Seattle, Ballard and Interbay, Magnolia, and north Seattle," yet the bypass tunnel option eliminates the Western Ave exit and adds at least 5 minutes to commute time to the Ballard/Interbay/Magnolia area. Please find a way to keep a suitable exit in place if the bypass tunnel option is picked. The surface street alternative is not attractive either, as we need the higher capacity link through the western side of the city.

433

Comment

Your site concentrates reader attention on alternatives to replacing the viaduct. Why, however, have you not even offered for public consideration the cheapest, easiest, environmentally friendliest, and perhaps most responsible view in the long run, via, get rid of the thing altogether WITHOUT replacing it? Living in the South End as I do, I find the viaduct very helpful getting downtown or to places in NW Seattle, but if it didn't exist, I would hardly be stymied. The move might encourage people overall to further consider their public transit options (particularly if these are ever beefed up) and would help greatly in re-uniting the downtown core with the waterfront. Placement of the railroad and highway along the waterfront may have made sense when the city was very young, but now their positioning there can only be regarded as abominable. Let's get REALLY progressive for a change and do away with the thing permanently in the next few years. Channel funds that would! have been spent on it into a high-quality light-transit infrastructure instead.

434

Comment

Hey you people, You still keep saying that you can build a tunnel for the viaduct replacement that is only a billion dollars more then other alternatives. What are you smoking. Their has not been one large underground project built in Seattle that has been on time or on budget. Seattle has terrible soils, lots water(salt and fresh) that has cause overruns and delays on every significant public project built. Modern environmental, business migration, ever present lawsuits will make it impossible for you to build a tunnel for \$4 billion dollars. It upsets me that you even present such a unrealistic alternative, give false hope to people. I fully expect everyone of your alternatives will cost in excess of \$4+ billion dollars. The only realistic one that offers any hope to the Region's transportation needs is the aerial one.

435

Comment

My preferred option is the Rebuild Alternative. This appears to be the best compromise for providing traffic flow, minimizing the costs, taking the least space, maximizing constructability, and minimizing construction time. This also appears to provide the best access for the west side traffic (Ballard/ Interbay, etc.), which is essential. It would be a traffic nightmare to have the westside traffic go through downtown to get to the southend or to I-5 or use additional surface streets to get to the proposed tunnel. For the south section I would suggest looking at providing aerial structure (or flyover, if you wish) over 1st Ave So. directly to the 4th Ave So. flyover on So. Atlantic St. This could provide a complete aerial from the Viaduct to I-90 without the cross traffic of the surface streets. For the south section it is not clear what the benefits/pros/cons for aerial or surface roadway might be. Suggest that this comparison be made more direct and obvious when the final alternative is chosen. By including the south aerial and Bell Street Tunnel refurbishment in the Aerial Alternative, not clear what the real cost trade is between the Aerial and Rebuild Alternatives. Obviously, larger structure means somewhat higher cost for the Aerial, but the ground rules for comparing the alternatives should be the same. For the Aerial and Rebuild Alternatives, has any consideration been given to employing "tinker toy" type of construction? Whereby, large sections would be constructed off-site and then barged to the waterfront to be lifted into place, and then bolted and cabled. General techniques such as this have been employed successfully for bridge construction to minimize the costs, impact on traffic, and duration of construction.

436

Comment

I am in favor of only the rebuild or aerial alternatives because the price is less than a tunnel and they both preserve the views that should remain free for all. Despite protestations to the contrary, if the tunnel alternative is chosen, there may indeed be a park built, but it will be backed by private property-condos-as evidenced by how many of those ugly things have already been built. The view belongs to everyone and must not be privatized. The view from a park at ground level would not replace what we currently have & would be a huge loss to all, except the prospective condo dwellers. The argument that the viaduct cuts the city off from the waterfront is not convincing to me. One can easily walk over (at the elevated walk to the ferry dock) or beneath the viaduct. Only those whose views include the viaduct could possibly benefit by its removal. Comparing their small numbers with the many who would be deprived of the quintessential Seattle view provided by driving on the viaduct reveals that the majority should be able to continue to enjoy the views the viaduct provides. Parkland could replace the parking areas under the viaduct if parkland is the issue, but then where would users of the waterfront businesses and recreation park?? I believe the park issue is an imaginative & fantastic red herring. The pressure to "redevelop" the waterfront with condos would be overwhelming; the county's appetite for property taxes is very well known. I support only the rebuild or aerial alternatives as the only choices that preserve the views for all Seattleites.

437

Comment

The most expensive solutions would be any of those that do not allow for the development of a world class destination waterfront park. The history of such facilities enhancing (increasing) adjacent property values, which also generate the associated property and retail sales taxes, is overwhelming. It is the only solution that provides a continuous public income stream into the predictable future. We must be long range smart. That such a park will greatly enhance the livability of our city is no small item, but the steady public and private income stream must not be denied. Thank you for this opportunity to share my thoughts with you.

438

Comment

Based on your environmental impact statement, I think we have been handed an opportunity to deal once-and-for-all with a problem that has been long discussed in Seattle. Many citizens, business owners and people involved in Seattle's economic development have wanted for years to get rid of the blight created by the Viaduct. Now we have the opportunity to do that for very little cost. Since the Viaduct must be replaced no matter what, the cost of finally getting rid of it for good is only the difference between the replacement cost and the tunnel cost. A small price to pay for the enormous economic and social benefits created. One thing mentioned a couple of times in your EIS is the trade-off of views for drivers v. people living, working, and shopping downtown and tourists on the waterfront. In my opinion people who are driving shouldn't be distracted by spectacular views anyway, especially when traveling at sixty miles per hour on an aerial route. As your EIS points out, removing the Viaduct completely opens expansive views for all the people who live and work downtown at or below the viaduct level. What isn't mentioned is that it also IMPROVES the quality of the view for all who live or work ABOVE the Viaduct. So everyone downtown benefits by putting the route underground. Also not mentioned in the EIS is the important fact that the tunnel options open up the view BACK toward the city FROM the waterfront for all the tourists on the waterfront and tourists entering the city by boat and ship. That's a LOT to be gained for the sake of what drivers lose who should be paying attention to the road and not the view anyway. And it's LOT to be gained for the difference in price between rebuilding the viaduct and building a tunnel. As your EIS mentions, the tunnel options also greatly dampen the horrendous noise across the entire face of our town. Who wants to roaring traffic while they're enjoying our city's primary tourist attraction -- its waterfront -- or what could be its primary tourist attraction. What's more important? A spectacular view for those who are on the viaduct for all of five minutes at 55mph ... or the view plus freedom from noise for those who look at the view for several hours many days a week? Would it make more sense to save the view for people who shouldn't be looking while taking it away from all of those who should??? One political argument that has been raised against the Viaduct is that fuel truck will not be able to travel through a tunnel. To the best of my knowledge that is the only negative traffic impact of the six-lane tunnel. In fifteen years of traveling the viaduct, I don't think I've ever seen a fuel truck. So, they can't represent a ignorant traffic factor. I would also point out that putting fuel trucks twenty feet above the ground at sixty miles an hour is as questionable from a safety point of view as running them through a tunnel. Perhaps its time for the Seattle Fire Department to consider the risk of a fuel truck careening over the rails and throwing its fuel all over the streets below. The city would be safer if the small number of fuel trucks involved traveled at ground level on I-5. There is no fishing fleet nor any pleasure boats on the downtown waterfront, so there would be no impact to the maritime industry along the waterfront. Any maritime fuel needs along the downtown waterfront are already handled by the surface roads anyway because you can't drive a fuel truck off of the viaduct to service the downtown maritime industry. Delivering oil between the Ballard Interbay area and the Duwamish and West Seattle via I-5 would only add a few extra miles. All the needs of downtown ought not to be held hostage to that minor increase in delivery costs. Since all other maritime truck deliveries can still happen by the tunnel, the only impact to the maritime industry would be the delivery of flammables between north and south Seattle. That's a tiny economic impact compared to the unmeasured negative economic impact that already exists with the raised Viaduct. Removing the viaduct will remove an enormous EXISTING negative impact and result in a huge economic boon for all of downtown. If the state is going to stretch beyond its approximate \$2M fundraising capacity, then stretch the furthest and enable Seattle to do a major project right for once. The enormous economic and social benefits of putting all the traffic underground -- the big tunnel -- is an absolute bargain, given that the difference in cost between building the aerial and the tunnel is only half a billion dollars. I also want to point out that expanding the existing aerial by twenty feet makes the Viaduct bigger an uglier than ever, and so many people already hate the imposing shadow of the existing viaduct and the dank, dirty area underneath that an expanded aerial only makes the current situation worse. Now is the only shot we'll ever have at putting the entire blight of the Viaduct underground. To miss this opportunity for the sake of immediate financial considerations would be the biggest political mistake in a long, long time. The economic cost to the city of Seattle over the next hundred years that is imposed even by the existing Viaduct is almost incalculable. By comparison the cost of the big tunnel (with all the ramp options for serving Ballard and Interbay) is calculable and a bargain. Do it right. Pick the Cadillac option that will forever improve the city of Seattle. In the process, don't add any new lanes of traffic to the surface. Keep that area for parking and for park space. (Ideally, you should even add underground parking for the waterfront in order to get the automobile as far out of the picture as possible.) This will be the single greatest improvement to city of Seattle since the World's Fair. And wasn't that all about Seattle being the Transportation City of the future. Let's live up to the promise of the World's Fair and think for the future, not allowing immediate financial constraints to hobble the city's future forever. The only cost of the tunnel now is the difference in price between that option and replacement. --David Haggith.

439

Comment

The tunnel alternative is the option which has something for everyone. This alternative recognizes the importance of SR-99 as an important alternative North-South major transportation corridor for moving people and freight to areas north and south of Seattle. At the same time, this alternative also recognizes the importance some people in the community place on improving the waterfront environment in downtown Seattle, with the removal of a major industrial element across the waterfront. While some might say that the tunnel option costs too much, it is important to recognize that none of the options presented are cheap, and the benefits of spending the incremental amount to improve aesthetics at the same time as solving the mobility problem will provide many benefits in livability and attractiveness which are not characterized fully in the EIS. Seattle has a track record of under engineering major civic projects in the city, from the four lane Evergreen Point Bridge built with no shoulders to the Kingdome, which had a lifespan of less than 25 years. It is time to break this trend and build infrastructure that can be depended on for many generations. Paying for the tunnel option now is a good investment for everyone living here, new and old.

440

Comment

To Whom it will Concern

We would like to weigh in with the Allied Arts recommendation as follows;

- cut and cover is best option after no viaduct at all
- no net increase in roadway to Alaskan Way
- any additional traffic to be dispersed among all avenues through downtown corridor
- lid over SR99 should extend from Pine to Battery
- Trolley on Alaskan Way should be moved to Western to create room for destinations on the waterfront

Thank you

Taylor and Anita Collings
2306 16th Ave East
Seattle, WA 98112

441

Comment

I am one of those people who actually like the viaduct, but I have changed my mind about wanting to keep it. I also do not like the idea of a major money-draining tunnel project and its potentially negative impact on the Pike Place Market, and most of all, I do NOT like the idea of an expanded-lane surface street along our waterfront. We should be reducing street traffic there, not increasing it. I am writing to urge you to help take advantage of an incredible opportunity for Seattle. The Alaskan Way Viaduct has cut Seattle off from its waterfront since the 1950's. The end of its useful life offers us a chance to remedy one of the worst urban planning decisions in Seattle's history, and reclaim our connection to Elliott Bay. Other cities around the globe have recognized and remedied similar mistakes, to the current and long-term benefit of their communities. I believe that the City of Seattle and the Central Puget Sound region will be more vital and more successful if we do not build a new highway along Seattle's central waterfront. Improvements to arterial connections and transit would allow us to accommodate Viaduct freight and car traffic while easing congestion for us all, avoid a decade of disruption to businesses and residents, and avoid the billion dollar liabilities of a megaproject. We owe it to ourselves and our children to be rethink the way we provide stewardship to Seattle's waterfront. Therefore, I urge you to work toward the inclusion of a "no-highway" alternative in the Viaduct EIS. Sincerely, Ann Bieri

442

Comment

Dear Committee, I ride on the viaduct every day. The views of the city and of Elliot Bay are inspiring to me, any day of the year. To think about driving this stretch in a tunnel is depressing. Traffic usually flows along well, which is why I vote for rebuild rather than aerial, but when there is a traffic jam due to an accident or a ballgame, can you imagine sitting in a carbon monoxide-filled tunnel?? If the rebuild wins, contract visual artists to help with the design. Make it a beautiful viaduct - perhaps mirror the triangular structure of the baseball stadium. The triangle is the strongest form in architecture, and this kind of design would allow one to almost "see through" the viaduct. I am very opposed to the tunnel for the reasons I mentioned above, and because it seems there will be a lunge for the prime real estate that will open up. Frankly, I think the waterfront we have now is very vibrant. Building a tunnel instead of the viaduct isn't suddenly going to attract business people down to the waterfront to "stick their big toes in the Sound," as one newspaper article wrote. Our waterfront is cold many times, and full of tourists and homeless people. But the music on the pier, the boats, shops and restaurants are fine as they are. We don't need more retail there, set up by companies profiting by the building of a tunnel. Also, if there was an earthquake, I would much rather be above the ground, than below. The surface alternative is ludicrous. The waterfront would be unapproachable, loud, and dirty. Please consider the PEOPLE of Seattle when these alternatives are decided. I'm on the viaduct twice a day, most of the year, rain or shine. I love the view, and the feeling that I am "home" when I look around up there. Sincerely, Laura Drake

443

Comment

I recently moved into a downtown water-view apartment. While the view from my apartment is amazing, it is quite an eyesore to see the I-99 Viaduct out the window of my apartment. In addition to the appearance, there is also the issue of noise created by the viaduct. If you are looking for a way to re-vitalize the downtown area and attract a wider range of people, you should definitely choose the tunnel option. Don't clutter the scenic Seattle Waterfront by rebuilding the same old double-stacked interstate. Instead, place the 6 lanes underground and turn the above-ground part of the project into a well-groomed park-like street that provides access to the downtown area. Many may argue that the cost is prohibitive, or that the well-to-do are the only ones worried about appearance. However, Seattle boasts a strong tourism industry and should be conscious of the appearance of downtown. If you think building the full tunnel is expensive, implement one of the other decisions! and see how long it is before people demand even more capacity. At least this way, once the tunnels are constructed all of the above-ground land can be turned into whatever is needed. Perhaps some day there Alaskan Way will be double stacked on top of 6 lanes of tunnels, it's always easier to build from the bottom up.

444

Comment

The cut-and-cover tunnel alternative is the best option, but even it falls short of enabling a great waterfront. There should be no net increase in roadway to Alaskan Way. Any additional traffic on the surface should be dispersed among all avenues running through the downtown corridor. The lid over SR 99 should extend from Pike to Battery. The trolley on Alaskan Way should be moved to Western to create room for destinations on the waterfront and better neighborhood connections by trolley. The option of no highway at all should be fully explored. This is a great opportunity to connect the downtown to the waterfront.

445

Comment

I do not support replacing the viaduct. I do support tearing it down and investing any transportation funds in expanding I-5 and our east/west transportation corridors...widen 520. I particularly do not want to see any viaduct construction, if so decided, prior to completion of other transportation projects (light rail/monorail). Their completion is necessary to mitigate and evaluate transportation requirements for WA-99 through Seattle. I'm opposed to continued use of an outdated tunnel (Battery Street Tunnel) that would funnel traffic toward an outdated and restrictive lined bridge (Aurora bridge). Let's encourage traffic to go into downtown or around it and open up our waterfront for the public to enjoy.

446

Comment

Dear viaduct Committee, I was raised in Seattle, WA and have memories of traveling on the viaduct. When I was younger I did not really care about the viaduct itself, I only cared that when traveling on it I could smell the Ivar's French fries cooking, and my mom would point out the Olympic Mountains to me, telling me that we were lucky to have such a nice view from the city. Now that I am older (currently fourteen years old) I care about my city more, which includes everything from the homeless population to transportation. I live in West Seattle and go to an Alternative school in Northgate. I hate it when there is traffic. When the freeway is packed we take 99, which carries us over the viaduct and straight into West Seattle. Sometimes I miss the bus and my mom drives me to school. It is a long way, but by taking the viaduct it makes traveling easy, not to mention giving us a beautiful view. In my opinion, a tunnel would clutter things up and there would be no more smelling Ivar's French fries, but ! instead car exhaust. There would also be no more beautiful view of the Olympic Mountain range, but instead concrete. To me, the viaduct is a part of Seattle's downtown and I would hate to see a tunnel in its place. I vote for the rebuild. Thank you for letting me voice my opinion. Sincerely, Gemma Clarke

447

Comment

Considering all the options for replacement, and the future need to create a visitor/resident-friendly waterfront, the reconstruction of the seawall combined with a covered below-grade tunnel (a la Mercer island I-90) seems the best solution in terms of accomplishing 1) easy access to the waterfront, 2) adequate traffic capacity for the present and future, and 3) improved amenities all 'round.

448

Comment

Draft EIS is deficient in evaluating impacts of construction on pedestrian traffic and safety on the waterfront. Draft EIS is deficient in evaluating impacts of dirt and noise pollution on the waterfront area during the proposed construction. Draft EIS is deficient in evaluating impacts of lost parking and waterfront access for residents and visitors to the waterfront. Public hearings simply did not exist. Format was an open house with no opportunity for public comment. All comments were given in private formats -- such as online, written, or through transcription. It is my right to have my comments heard by other concerned citizens, and my right to be able to hear the comments of others. No opportunity was given for me to exercise these rights.

449

Comment

I have two comments about the draft EIS and will start with the most practical one: Has a tunnel in a different location ever been considered? A tunnel under 1st Ave that would connect to the Battery St tunnel for instance. This tunnel could be built while the existing viaduct is in place, minimizing construction impact there and creating opportunities to develop the right of way of the existing viaduct, which can help financing the tunneling project. Drilling techniques could be used because the soil under First Ave is more solid, which means that construction impact will be concentrated to a smaller area. My second comment is that the EIS is very technical, a very straight forward problem-solution document. I think the document should reflect more than just the fact that 110.000 cars need to be able to drive here. The replacement of the viaduct is a project with a much broader scope than just the technical traffic problem. It's an opportunity for the city to develop a new face, connect downtown to the waterfront, develop new property near the waterfront, creating a place that's attractive to everyone, from tourists to local residents and I think this project should reflect that. In my opinion it's strange that the DPD is planning for the redevelopment of the waterfront, assuming that a tunnel alternative will be realized, while DOT prepares an EIS in which 3 of the 5 alternatives do not involve a tunnel. DPD and DOT should be working together in a project organization, together with private developers and engineering agencies, and develop some sort of public private partnership, in which the potential of private investments in the project will be fully explored. The benefit to the public should be the number one objective in this project and barriers like divisions between DPD and DOT budget or private and public investments should be overcome.

450

Comment

I live above the viaduct 1/4 mile south of the Battery Tunnel entrance. I use rte 99 going south every day to work at Boeing on E. Marginal way, and return on it every evening. Nevertheless, I would prefer that the waterfront corridor be decommissioned as a high-speed traffic conduit, above or below the ground. Why? Here are my reasons: 1) My domestic life would be demolished by any of the alternatives in the EIS. The construction noise, dust, and debris will ruin the nascent downtown neighborhood I live in. 2) Pike Place Market and the First Avenue and Western Avenue merchants will find their custom drying up during the ten-year construction period. My neighborhood, only recently coming to life, will be thrown back to the scary, empty streets of the past. Tourism will suffer. 3) Any of these alternatives will drive my taxes way up and/or drive the next generation of Seattleites into unbelievable debt. Our economy and our city are not booming any more. We simply can't afford to replace the viaduct by any of the EIS alternatives - we need a more affordable alternative. 4) During construction traffic will have to find other ways north and south through or around the city. I hear that DOT has plans to ease this traffic. If we can survive major blockages for extended periods during the construction, why can't we just use the necessary detours as the basis for a "no construction" alternative? 5) Something great could be done with our waterfront and our downtown "village" if we find another way to deal with elimination of the viaduct. I was in Vancouver last week - what a great job they have done using their natural topography and waterfront! Look at what happened when San Francisco took down the Embarcadero Freeway without replacing it - they removed an ill-conceived waterfront high-speed viaduct, freed up a wonderful space, and made a vibrant new center for the city. 6) I am surprised to find that there is not a "redistribute traffic" alternative in the EIS. In my job I am often required to do engineering trade studies or alternative analyses - and we always look at the "do as little as possible" alternative. Often it is the best solution. Please do not settle on one of these alternatives without looking at a less expensive, less disruptive, more creative solution. Decommissioning the high-speed corridor along our waterfront has potentials for the future of Seattle without loading the next generation with debt; without building an expensive solution that may, itself, not do well during a large earthquake; without damaging the downtown residential neighborhood. We need an affordable alternative that enhances our city. I'd like to see the project apply its obvious analytical strengths to this unexamined alternative.

451

Comment

Mr. Mayor, they say that politicians don't attend to email as they do to postal mail. I hope they are wrong. I urge you to reject the idea of rebuilding the high-speed conduit through the waterfront corridor. We can't afford it, nor can our kids. It will kill my neighborhood and the waterfront for years - and the tourist trade along with them. Any of the alternatives described in the draft EIS will be incredibly expensive, incredibly disruptive to the heart of the city, will generate short and long term new traffic problems, and will be ugly. I think the people's waterfront coalition has some great ideas - I just viewed their website this evening - about renewing the waterfront and connecting it with the city by eliminating the high-speed viaduct. Let mesa that I did read the draft EIS in March, and was depressed by what Saw. All of the alternatives are expensive, complicated, and disruptive. Please consider another way for Seattle. Bruce Pollock

452

Comment

As a business owner in Pioneer Square, I would like to sign in my opinion on the viaduct repair/replacement. I am dismayed that ANY parking will be removed as this is a real hindrance to my business. However, after reviewing the EIS draft, it appears to me the best solution would be the tunnel. This would be the safer and less invasive action to the waterfront views/ pedestrian walkways as I see it. I will keep abreast of this development. Sincerely, Susan Woltz

453

Comment

I support the tunnel alternative, with redevelopment of the water front. This is a great opportunity to open up the water front to the city while replacing the aging viaduct and sea wall.

454

Comment

To Whom It May Concern: I believe the tunnel option is by far the best. The surface option is obviously flawed because of increased traffic congestion. Seattle certainly does not need more of that. All the other options call for an unsightly, obtrusive structure like the current viaduct. I grew up in Chicago and love the waterfront available to the public in that great city. It is one of the aspects that makes Chicago such a desirable city to live, work and play in. It is unfortunate that the available waterfront in Seattle is so limited in a city with so much water! A mixture of a waterfront park and Alaska Ave is the best choice for this prized real estate. It will help current waterfront businesses, stimulate new businesses, and add more energy into downtown. People of Seattle will want to be there, not just the tourists. I understand that this project is more costly than the other options, but great cities have great civil projects. It is what separates them from other average cities. Seattle has the potential to be one of North America's greatest cities, lets not waste it. Dr. Eric Bergstrom Small Business Owner- Queen Anne

455

Comment

I really appreciate your efforts to solicit public input on this big project. I support the idea of the new SR 99 being in a tunnel but rather than a cut and cover mess that will shut down the whole area for years, I'm thinking that putting the six lanes of traffic in a sea bed tube/chunnel would have far less impact on the area. I know that this is not one of the alternatives identified so far but I'm wondering if anyone has thought of doing this? They have an under the bay tunnel in Boston.... thanks for all your hard work!

456

Comment

I am a strong supporter of the Cut and Cover Tunnel Option.

Thank you,

Gwendolyn W. Nicholson
2341 Rosemont Pl.W.
Seattle, WA 98199
gnicholson10@comcast.net

457

Comment

I'd like to see the tunnel built to replace the viaduct at least as far as Broad Street--and more tunnel later to replace the Mercer mess. Doing half a job rarely is cost effective, like replacing the viaduct and shoring up the seawall. Looking at the future of the city, an open waterfront would be a huge asset, and hiring the people needed to build the tunnel and the new seawall could go far to improve our current employment situation. Every job created makes at least two others, so we'd be a much more prosperous city. To deal with the traffic jam while the tunnel is being built, I'd put big tolls on I-5, and have shuttle busses every 10 minutes coming into and out of and around the city center from big park-and-ride lots north and south. And what about trains? Shutting down the viaduct would surely put more people on Sounder. For huge trucks coming from Canada, etc, it might be worth running a special ferry from Mukilteo to Tacoma.

458

Comment

Even though I live in Tacoma, I am in Seattle fairly regularly. I have lived in the area since 1972, and have always considered the AWV an eyesore born of transportation expediency over quality-of-life esthetics. Replacing one viaduct with another would be rejection of a golden opportunity to put the traffic UNDERGROUND and develop a human-friendly waterfront which would help to attract Seattleites and visitors alike. The city council need to study not what replacement option to pursue, but how to best utilize the open space which will be created when (may it be soon!) the AWV is torn down and given a proper burial. Which brings up another thought: recycle the concrete from viaduct to tunnel ala the Kingdome!

459

Comment

The tunnel alternative may be more costly, but generations to come will thank us for the unimpeded downtown to waterfront connection.

460

Comment

I believe that the Alaskan Way Viaduct should be the Washington State Department of Transportation's highest priority project. Thank you for undertaking this important work, and providing an opportunity for the region's citizens to shape the direction of this project, which will have a long-lasting impact on the quality of life of the City of Seattle. This is a rare opportunity to reclaim a critically important part of downtown Seattle, and to reconnect the city to the waterfront. Unfortunately, all of the alternatives seem to treat Seattle's Central Waterfront as simply a linear, north-south corridor through which to move as many vehicles as possible. While there is some discussion of improved views with the removal of the aerial structure, none of the alternatives adequately address the urban design aspects of the project, or treat the waterfront area itself as an important amenity for the city, the region, or indeed the entire state. This is seen in the answers to the questions "How would the alternative change access?" "How would the alternative change bicycle access?" and "How would the alternative change pedestrian access?" Answers to the first question only describe vehicle access to the facility (be it tunnel, aerial structure, or surface alignment) from the north or south. In answers to the other access questions, the location of the linear, north-south bicycle/pedestrian Waterfront Trail is discussed. The analysis neglects to consider that there are over 20 locations where east-west street-ends in downtown Seattle intersect with Alaskan Way. (These intersections are discussed as potential points of vehicle congestion - presumably a negative in this analysis - but are not considered as critical features for equally important pedestrian and bicycle access to the waterfront.) Quite naturally, pedestrians and cyclists will want to cross Alaskan Way at these locations to the waterfront, its amenities, and its businesses. Most will not care to use pedestrian overpasses such as the one that feeds into the ferry terminal, or the new ones mentioned that could "possibly" be developed at Madison and Thomas Streets. At any rate, pedestrian overpasses are a poor substitute for direct surface crossings. A similar lack of information about pedestrian and bicycle use of streets and roadways is evident in the discussion of "How will streets and intersections operate?" Potential congestion levels are discussed at intersections, and vehicle volumes along roadways, yet there is no mention of the equally important function of roads as pedestrian and cyclist facilities. A tremendous - and growing - number of people walk and bike along these roads. Possible impacts to pedestrians and cyclists are not mentioned. With any of the alternatives, how will pedestrians and cyclists safely cross Alaskan Way? How many signalized, marked intersections will there be for pedestrians? Will there be pedestrian refuge areas - particularly in the alternatives with trolley elements? Boulevard landscaping? Pedestrian amenities such as benches, human-scaled lighting? Directional signage? A Waterfront Trail traveling parallel to the waterfront is meaningless if there are no safe, direct east-west connections across Alaskan Way to the waterfront itself. In addition to these pedestrian and bicycle access issues, the DEIS also lacks a discussion of the character of the corridor itself. Many groups and individual citizens have commented in the media and in public forums about the potential for developing a significant amount of new open space - be it in privately developed plazas as part of commercial or residential redevelopment of the half blocks to the east of the present viaduct, or in public park land - as part of the project. Where in the DEIS are these issues fully discussed? This is the first time in a generation that the city and region have an opportunity to significantly reshape part of the region's urban core, and provide additional amenities that are otherwise sorely lacking. I point to the City of Portland's redevelopment of its riverfront, San Francisco's redevelopment of the Embarcadero, and Boston's reclamation of its direct water access. These cities developed public park areas, commercial and residential areas, promenades and urban amenities of which their citizens are rightly proud. Seattle should do no less. In other words, the DEIS seems to lack a discussion of how the waterfront of the City of Seattle will be improved with any of these alternatives. It discusses the potential to move a lot of vehicles THROUGH the city at high speeds, but does not talk about the ultimate effect on the shape and character of the city itself. They all lack a discussion of how people, be they tourists, residents or downtown workers, will safely access the waterfront and its attractions and amenities, and how this project will improve the Central Waterfront.

461

Comment

This project should offer opportunity to beautify Seattle. No elevated roadways and minimize traffic on waterfront. Tunnel proposal with six lane of traffic is best plan. City can be responsible for above ground plans.

462

Comment

I am so sad to see the folks of Seattle requesting the most expensive alternative to fixing the viaduct. A park? New Development? Who do they expect to pay for this project? My guess is that they expect the Federal Government and State Government to pay almost all the costs. Guess what? The DOT has not only spent all their money, but also have spent all the Federal Gas Tax that represents this States share. I would like to see how Seattle plans to pay for this dream. Increased Sales Tax in the City of Seattle. Increase the Seattle Property tax? Some new Seattle Tax? Folks, the highway system in the State is broken and it is getting worse, not better. There are no excess funds for these wonderful dreams, but if you have the money in Seattle to pay for it. Go for it!!!!!!!!!!!!!! Just don't ask for any of the money that should be spent on the roads all of us use... Thanks

463

Comment

The cut-and-cover tunnel alternative is the best option by far! As an architect and a long-time Seattle citizen, I believe this will do the most good for Seattle culturally and financially. A few further points: There should be no net increase in roadway to Alaskan Way. Any additional traffic on the surface should be dispersed among all avenues running through the downtown corridor. The lid over SR 99 should extend from Pike to Battery. The trolley on Alaskan Way should be moved to Western to create room for destinations on the waterfront and better neighborhood connections by trolley.

464

Comment

I just read an article in the Seattle Times, it is the Friday May 21st issue about a no-highway waterfront and I think that is a great idea. I didn't see it in the EIS as an option and I wonder why not. It is beginning to be pretty obvious that we can't afford to rebuild or even replace the viaduct, so why not just take it down and build a nice waterfront. Cars have to go away we just can't keep driving our cars all the time. Completely ridiculous, the world is running out of oil and it not a viable option to replace it or even rebuild it. I'd like to see this as an option, thank you.

465

Comment

EIS is insufficient because it does not analyze what is likely the simplest, cheapest, and least disruptive solution: fixing the larger transportation network instead of building a new highway. I'd recommend adding this alternative to the study. Study its feasibility. This may be an option that we can afford and can implement in short order while enhancing the vitality and connectivity of Seattle's downtown and waterfront. Its extremely important that we don't lose this chance to reconnect the city to its waterfront. We need to put the focus on accessibility and mobility for people not cars.

466

Comment

None of the options presented are acceptable. Each would continue the severe disruption of the quality of life in downtown Seattle that the existing viaduct has foisted on an unwilling citizenry for half a century now, all for the sake of a quick alternative route through the city for suburban locals who know about it. The viaduct should be torn down and replaced with a quiet two-lane boulevard, a new Seattle Central Park, and a broad array of amenities for residents and visitors to enjoy. Vehicular access to the waterfront should be limited to a few major east-west corridors. The money you're thinking of spending to replace the viaduct should instead be dedicated to expanding and improving I5 through the city and covering it with a longer lid, and to improving the ability of the north-south avenues through the city to handle semi-local traffic. I405 could also usefully be expanded and improved to handle traffic that can bypass Seattle. That will accomplish a much better result all around.

467

Comment

May 27th

Mayor Greg Nickels
600 4th Ave, 7th Floor
PO Box 94749
Seattle, WA 98124

Dear Mr. Nickels,

I am writing to urge you to help take advantage of the incredible opportunity for Seattle. The Alaskan Way Viaduct has cut Seattle off from its waterfront since the 1950s. The end of its useful life offers us a chance to remedy one of the worst urban planning decisions in Seattle's history and reclaim our connections to Elliot Bay. Other cities around the globe have recognized and remedied similar mistakes to the current and long range benefit of their communities. I believe that City of Seattle and the Central Puget Sound region will be more vital and more successful if we do not build a new highway along Seattle's central waterfront.

Improvements to arterial connections and transit would allow us to accommodate viaduct freight and car traffic while easing congestion for us all, avoid a decade of disruption to businesses and residents, and avoid the billion dollar liabilities of a megaproject. We owe it to ourselves and our children to rethink the way we proudly stewardship to Seattle's waterfront. Therefore, I urge you to work towards the inclusion of a "no highway" alternative to the Viaduct EIS.

468

Comment

One thing we should not be doing with any rebuild of the Viaduct is encouraging more people to use their personal vehicles. The more lanes we provide means the more traffic capacity and the less traffic backups, at the cost of having more people take to their vehicles or at least to have less incentive to switch to mass transit options.

The current viaduct is not the most attractive part of our skyline, both for visitors on the ferry or cruise ships, but also for the people living downtown and close to the waterfront. Both the rebuild and aerial options will continue this cosmetic problem.

The surface option, while cost efficient, will make it even harder for people to walk from downtown to the waterfront and back -- traffic snarls and the inevitable traffic casualties will be a part of our daily lives.

In any other than a tunnel option, noise and extra traffic will be an auditory and visual pollution.

I would really encourage the use of a limited capacity (two lane, or at most three lane) tunnel option that extends most of the way through downtown, to allow a large continuous section of park that would adjoin the waterfront and downtown businesses. While in the short term, local residents will have to deal with the construction efforts, overall, property values will increase, due to the beauty that we will recover from those areas.

The cheapest alternative, and while my favorite, but probably untenable as an option, is to just remove the viaduct entirely and make no replacement. The costs would be significantly less than any of the aforementioned options, and traffic would have to spill into the rest of the city streets.

Sincerely,
Nathan Herring

469

Comment

I would like to comment on the Seattle Waterfront Viaduct Draft EIS:

- 1) I strongly support the cut and cover option to create a tunnel for the viaduct replacement.
- 2) I think that the width and speed of Alaskan way should be *reduced*, not increased, and Alaskan way made a purely local access road, if not removed altogether.
- 3) Any addition North-South traffic should be dispersed along all major North South routes.
- 4) The medium- and long-term consequences of sea-level rise as a possible result of global warming should be anticipated in replacing the sea wall.
- 5) the waterfront streetcar should be moved to Western Ave.
- 6) the northern limit of the lid over SR 99 should be extended from Pike to Battery
- 7) pedestrians and bicycles should be emphasized at crossings
- 8) the ferry terminal should be moved to the south waterfront
- 9) emphasizing the value of the waterfront as a destination for recreation, cultural events and tourism is important. the rebuilding of SR 99 can help create a great waterfront for our biggest city!

Sincerely,
Alex Steffen

470

Comment

WSDOT:

Please do not rebuild a highway on our shore without exploring no highway alternative.

Get a copy of the Bogue plan that years ago would have had all our trains under the city - not cutting off our waterfront. We do not need thru traffic on Seattle Way unique and precious waterfront. Make it a friendly safe part of our "main attraction" - not cars and pollution. With the new Sam sculpture gardens coming to our waterfront we need the freedom to walk safely and not have to compete with commercial traffic. Lets show the world we intend to make Seattle waterfront a first class destination.

471

Comment

May 27, 2004

Allison Ray
WSDOT Environmental Coordinator
Alaskan Way Viaduct and Seawall Replacement Project
999 Third Ave., Suite 2424
Seattle, WA 98104

Dear Ms. Ray,

I have read through the draft EIS for the Alaskan Way Viaduct and Seawall project. I have lived in Seattle all of my life, and have used the area's transportation network for the last 25 years. I have taken a keen interest in transportation issues in the area, and particularly the larger ones, such as SR99, SR520, and I-405 challenges.

All of the options are expensive, and that is to be expected with a project of this nature. Nonetheless, I feel that it is important to invest the money in a revitalized SR99 corridor, and I feel the most cost-effective, least risky approach is either the Rebuild or Aerial alternatives. While the tunnel option appears attractive, I think it is inherently more risky, and would be more difficult to maintain. The view corridors to be created would not really benefit the average citizen; rather, they would benefit a few property owners in the first few floors of downtown properties. All of our previous experiences with tunneling in the Seattle area suggest that it is problematic, expensive, and presents significant risk of cost overruns.

A surface alternative is entirely unrealistic, and will result in significant negative traffic impacts on the downtown surface streets, but more importantly on I-5. I-5 through the downtown area is already congested during a significant portion of the day, and pretending that all of the traffic that bypasses downtown via the viaduct can be handled with a surface street seems absurd. In addition, the effect of increased through traffic on Alaskan Way itself will prove to be even more of a barrier between the waterfront and downtown than the current viaduct is perceived to be.

The viaduct as it exists today is worn out and obsolete, but the concept is still viable. That is: grade separate the through traffic, limit the on and off ramps, and provide an alternative for freight and vehicular traffic, while allowing easier pedestrian access to the waterfront from downtown. An Aerial or Rebuild alternative would replace the viaduct, built to 21st century traffic and seismic standards, would repair the seawall, and be a significant improvement from the current situation.

I look forward to following the continued progress of this important project. I appreciate the effort required to produce the Draft EIS. I would be happy to comment further, so please feel free to contact me.

Sincerely,

Brad Cummings, Seattle

472

Comment

Thank you for allowing me to contribute to the conversation regarding this most important project. I am highly supportive of the tunnel alternative for replacement of the viaduct. This will greatly enhance the usability of the surface areas on the waterfront, reduce noise pollution, provide for a cleaner and more accessible downtown corridor and contribute to making our city a shining gem in the Puget Sound region. We have already lost the majority of industrial users in this location and have seemed to focus more on development of tourist industry for the central downtown waterfront, which I believe is much preferable, allocating other, more suitable locations for industrial use. Why not make it a stellar project? Regardless of what solution is eventually chosen, however, it must include the incorporation of greater mass transit options into the design. Light rail accessibility should be implemented into any design option chosen. We MUST quit trying to do everything on the cheap in Seattle and move our city into the 21st century with vision and an eye to becoming a truly international hub. Currently, we continue to be a small player and if we fail in this task, we will condemn ourselves to do the same.

473

Comment

Replacement options for the viaduct should not dramatically increase any traffic on Alaskan Way or existing roads, therefore the cut-and-cover alternative looks preferable (other than utterly artful viaduct redone with stunning arches).

Increased traffic on those surface roads make the city feel inhumane. For example, although I live in Belltown/QA, a walk to Lake Union or Capital Hill is wholly unwelcoming due to those high traffic roads such as Denny.

The trolley should NOT be moved although it could make sense (and be helpful to the elderly and disabled) were it to turn up the hill and continue onto the Seattle Center.

Jeannette

474

Comment

6-10 years is too long to disrupt the waterfront. I suggest not building the "temporary" bypass, and let drivers find alternative routes which will save 1/2 billion dollars, and speed up the project.

475

Comment

Guayaquil, Ecuador and Barcelona, Spain both have beautiful waterfront parks and I hope that our planners can see them via the internet or mail, or at least one of them personally.

476

Comment

The full tunnel alternative is the only way to go. Anything else compromises both transportation and public space.

477

Comment

the environmental review process requires all options to be evaluated. That doesn't mean that all options considered are viable. Is the (viaduct) decision about moving the maximum number of vehicles for the least amount of money? No. It's much broader. Yes, for years the viaduct allowed west edge travelers to avoid downtown, even let them see the sound at 60 mph. Stupid indulgence. To build another viaduct would be retro; far worse than the 50's idea to attract people to downtown by building above grade parking garages next to pedestrian-oriented streets. Freeways and neighborhoods don't mix, particularly when the freeway destroys the very essence of the neighborhood (which all too often happens). Think long term. Build the infrastructure to accommodate 100% of the moving vehicles and the parked vehicles below grade. Give the waterfront back to the people. Polish Seattle's front door to the world.

478

Comment

Re: the Alaskan Way Viaduct

I lived in the Seattle area for the first 60 years of my life, and am sure became immune to its beauty. I don't get back very often, but when I do I always drive the Alaskan viaduct. I defy anyone to find a more beautiful sight. The big buildings, the port, the mountains, and Puget Sound are awesome to behold, and unique to Seattle. Millions of people observe this beauty, and am sure include it in their visiting itinerary. Exchanging the viaduct for a tunnel will make Seattle less desirable for tourists, and for those Seattle citizens that really appreciate the beauty the city offers. For those living along the viaduct suffering the noise, and lack of view sorry it was there first.

Earl Pilgrim
105 SE Arcadia Pt. RD.

479

Comment

The major consideration has to be maintaining through capacity, which means the seawall and cut/cover tunnel or the aerial structure. At the same time it seems reasonable to do without an elevated thoroughfare on the waterfront if possible. Freight volumes, public transit and high numbers of commuters may be best handled with the full-capacity tunnel alternative. It seems to me the time frame to complete the full-capacity tunnel alternative also weighs in its favor. The cost is higher, but the difference to us as taxpayers is relatively inconsequential. It seems likely to me the construction impacts may be more logically mitigated with the tunnel option. Thanks.

480

Comment

As a resident of Belltown, I have been carefully reviewing the proposed solutions for the viaduct. After completing my analysis, I would like to strongly encourage the state to look into the no highway solution. When I first heard this idea I scoffed at it as I felt the hindrance to area traffic would be too great, but after additional consideration I believe our money can be better spend in simply tearing down the viaduct for the following reasons:

1) A much greater portion of our traffic flows through I-5 and funds would be better spend improving flow around Mercer St and other causes of slowdown, including if needed, an elevated link between 99 on both the North and South sides of the city

2) The monorail will provide a much improved transportation option for those traveling from the North and South who currently take 99

3) Technological improvements over the next 10-20 years have the potential to greatly reduce existing need for single occupancy vehicle traffic in and out of the city (namely Personal Rapid Transit:

<http://www.skywebexpress.com>)

4) The best solution presently proposed, replacing the viaduct with a tunnel (which would be my vote if I had to choose from the existing plans), keeps an elevated artery in two key growing residential districts,

Belltown and Pioneer Square according to <http://www.wsdot.wa.gov/projects/viaduct/plans.cfm>. This misses a great opportunity to improve the regions of these neighborhoods that are hindered by crime and reduced property values resulting from the massive shadow and noise cast by an elevated roadway.

5) By eliminating HWY 99 through downtown Seattle, it provides a great opportunity to remake Highway-99 North of the city from its current

status as a heavily trafficked, crime ridden eye soar. Because traffic volumes will be reduced, the center lane could be eliminated, and the area from downtown on northward converted to a tree lined boulevard that serves as an enjoyable residential neighborhood, and a pleasurable connection into the downtown area.

A greatly applaud the hard work that state is putting into making our city and region a more enjoyable place to live, and would like to ask that you push to have this one additional alternative considered.

Thank you,

Brian McNeill

481

Comment

build the tunnel-do this right for the entire century-put a toll on it if necessary

482

Comment

May 27, 2004
2415 Western Ave. #513
Seattle, WA 98121

The Director
Washington State Department of Transportation
Dept. of Transportation Building
Olympia, WA 98504

Dear Director:

Please consider the enclosed excellent report as a reflection of our opinion with respect of the Seattle viaduct question. As long-time residents of the downtown area we have long pondered the terrible mistake of building this viaduct in the first place. It was absolutely criminal to separate the people from their waterfront as does this viaduct. It would be even more criminal to repeat this same mistake by now rebuilding the viaduct. The enclosed article provides the broad outline of an acceptable alternative at this time.

Sincerely yours,

Talmon R. and Marian Mager

An article from the May 27, 2004 edition of the Seattle Post-Intelligencer written by Brian Steinburg, entitled, Full tunnel will enhance waterfront, was attached.

483

Comment

To the DOT:

My suggestion is to take the viaduct out and replace it with a tunnel below sea-level.

My vision for the future of the Alaskan Way viaduct is integrated with my vision of the potential that the Seattle waterfront has as a civic institution. With the necessary removal of the Alaskan way viaduct, I think the city has a genuine opportunity to improve the quality of the waterfront by increasing the natural light along the waterfront as well as reduce noise pollution. Ultimately the vision for the waterfront would be a park type atmosphere that had businesses and shops along it.

I'd love to see the seawall removed to help improve the natural conditions for the sea-life in Puget Sound, as well as improve the quality of the feel of the waterfront. This would probably require the construction of a graded (sloped) seawall that isn't quite natural either; however it would drastically improve the habitat of marine invertebrates.

484

Comment

I agree wholeheartedly with the opinion of the Seattle PI columnist (Brian Steinburg) who wrote in today's paper that, " Only the full cut-and-cover tunnel would allow the waterfront to become a great public, regional amenity". Indeed, the other alternatives are far inferior. A lid over the viaduct as it emerges from the tunnel at Pine Street would provide a direct pedestrian connection from the waterfront to the Pike Place Market. Also, there would be no net increase of roadway. It doesn't make sense to fill up all the newly liberated land on the waterfront with traffic lanes. Currently, all viaduct replacement options from the state and city show more than 70 percent of the Alaskan Way corridor is dominated by traffic; some lanes are dedicated to taxis and delivery trucks. We need to eliminate these special-purpose lanes and move the trolley to Western Avenue where it can become a part of Seattle's transportation system instead of a tourist ride. By doing this, we provide more open space and destinations for people, humanizing the waterfront.

485

Comment

My first choice is the Aerial because we would gain the safety of having a "pull-over shoulder", but the down side is that it would take more years to build than the Rebuild. My second choice is the Rebuild. In both the Aerial and Rebuild the City of Seattle would continue to provide the views of nearby sea and mountains which is what makes Seattle special. With over 110,000 of us a day enjoying these views, as well as views of the waterfront piers and downtown, I feel it is the responsibility of the City Council to see that we don't lose this. When I went to the presentations of creative possibilities for the downtown waterfront I was very upset. Things I saw do not belong here. 1. we should not bring in sand to make beaches where we are envied for having a natural deep water harbor 2. we should not tear down the viaduct and put up more buildings (developers win, not THE PEOPLE)--forget the argument for adding to the tax base, the views are more important and I mean views for thousands of people every day, not just the privileged who live or work in town or the tourists 3. we shouldn't lose the parking we now have under the viaduct 4. we need to keep the piers for water-related activities and not allow condos and office space to go up along the waterfront.

486

Comment

A no-highway alternative should be studied in the EIS without a doubt. Why isn't it included? I am writing with great hope that Seattle will be able to take advantage of a once in a lifetime opportunity to reconnect downtown to the waterfront. Our city made a bad decision back in the 1950's and now we have a chance to fix this mistake. By offering a no-highway alternative, Seattle has the possibility to show the world we are a Smart-Seattle. I am the mother of a three year old and looking into the future of all children. Let's show future generations that a connection to nature and the community is more important than the isolation of driving in a car. My family owns only one car, we frequently take the bus and walk everywhere, and my husband bikes downtown to his office. Let's encourage a CLEAN city. How many times have I and countless others stood in Victor Steinbrueck Park looking over the railing and thinking, "Seattle, what a great city except for this highway impeding my view and my way to the waterfront". I believe that the City of Seattle and the Central Puget Sound region will be more vital and more successful if we do not build a new highway along Seattle's central waterfront. If we can save billions of dollars, keep downtown businesses running, redirect traffic and reclaim our connection to Elliott Bay all at the same time, let's do it! Improvements to arterial connections and transit would allow us to accommodate Viaduct freight and car traffic while easing congestion for us all. Let's not ignore the lessons other cities have learned the hard way. Let's avoid the billion dollar liabilities of a megaproject. Please, I urge you to work toward the inclusion of a "no highway" alternative in the Viaduct EIS.

487

Comment

I think the ideal option is the Tunnel Alternative, because that would open the waterfront up for people to use and make the whole area from Pike Place Market through Pioneer Square quiet and livable and human. The tunnel would also increase businesses along the waterfront and turn Seattle into The Most Livable City again. If the Tunnel Alternative is not approved I vote for Bypass Tunnel Alternative, as that would decrease the traffic noise significantly and still allow the waterfront area to be opened up more than it is now.

488

Comment

After thorough review of all alternatives, I strongly support the "tunnel" concept. This is a critical time in our city's history. It would be extremely short-sighted to simply build another elevated freeway. Yes, the tunnel may be more expensive in the short-run, but future dividends will come in the way of increased tourism, higher property values and a better quality of life for all the residents of this region. If the viaduct is taken down and the tunnel built as its replacement, housing development and business development will surely follow. Our greatest asset is the central waterfront, yet it is not used nearly as much as it would be if there were more open spaces and views available to all. Many other cities also made serious mistakes in the past by constructing major transportation networks along their waterfront. Two (2) of these cities have had the chance to do something about it - San Francisco (not by choice) and Boston. Both cities have benefited greatly by the removal of elevated freeways along their waterfront. Boston's "Big Dig" was controversial, but now that it is nearing completion, it is widely applauded. The "Big Dig" has re-made that City's waterfront, and with it made it one of the finest cities in the world. The revival along San Francisco's waterfront is truly remarkable. It is now an area that both tourists and residents gather at. Seattle has one chance to do the same. The Waterfront should be a place for the public to gather and enjoy one of the greatest settings in this County. This is not possible with an elevated freeway roaring overhead. It would truly be inconceivable for a City that prides itself on its parks and outdoor spaces to miss out on this opportunity by simply constructing a new elevated structure. Lastly, I suggest that the new tunnel be a "toll road" to help offset the extra cost incurred by constructing this more expensive alternative.

489

Comment

I have long thought that the tunnel was the only sensible future for the uneasy marriage of a transportation corridor along the downtown waterfront. Now my father, who has a master's degree in urban planning and is a PUD commissioner in Jefferson County has notified me that the idea needs support in the form of public comment. Please build a tunnel that provides the level of traffic sensible planning would dictate, and while doing so, a superior seawall, cognizant of Boston's lessons with cost overruns, was it Bechtel that did their "big dig"? I also think that Arnold Schwarzeneger's unprecedented bond issuances in California may prove to be a precedent others may eventually follow, the values always trump costs when it comes to the quality and vision of infrastructure investment.

490

Comment

I strongly support the Tunnel Alternative. I think this is the only reasonable option considering the city will have to live with what ever is built for at least fifty plus years. Once the viaduct is gone and through traffic is removed the waterfront will be opened up for redevelopment and many great options are possible at that point. I would in fact like to see the tunnel extended all the way to the existing Battery Street tunnel, with no elevated or above ground section along the waterfront. North of the Battery Street tunnel the below grade option should be built to accommodate overpasses for east/west streets through the South Lake Union area.

491

Comment

I live in Ballard and commute to Boeing-Kent, so I use the Viaduct every workday. I think the view from the Viaduct is one of the best in Seattle, and when I have visitors I always include the Viaduct in "tours." When I travel downtown, I do so by bus whenever possible. My criteria for a preferred alternative is that it (1) has the least impact on existing "footprint" (e.g. parking, views, destruction of existing buildings and streets, construction time); (2) has least cost; (3) does not depend on other projects to achieve its objectives. My first preference would be to strengthen and refurbish the existing structure, not rebuild it, along with making imperative improvements to the existing seawall. This was not an alternative you presented, but it is what I think is possible, considering likely funding. Of the alternatives presented, I prefer Rebuild. The aerial alternative does not provide sufficient benefits to offset increasing the footprint. The ! tunnels destroy the views. The surface alternative is totally unacceptable because it impacts both pedestrian and vehicle traffic. The much-propagandized "connection between the waterfront and downtown" will not occur under any alternatives. Already, the condos/office buildings marching down the east side of the waterfront like Sherman into Georgia have cut off views of the waterfront from downtown more than the Viaduct has; I proved this to myself in August 2002 by photographing the views along First Avenue from about Lenora to south of Pike Street. These buildings, when seen from the waterfront, cut off downtown, and by the time construction begins on any alternatives, will have made moot any attempt to provide green space on the east side of Alaskan Way. The only views left from the tunnel and surface street alternatives will be exclusively for the very rich who live in the penthouses of these buildings. Even walking along the waterfront, views of the Sound ! are cut off by structures today except in a few open spaces. There are too many options and assumptions about other transportation projects in all alternatives except Rebuild and No Build. If options are not exercised, Ballard and Interbay residents will be far worse off, transportation-wise, than before with these other alternatives.

492

Comment

hello, i am responding to the draft eis as a homeowner and on behalf of my family, which lives on Alaskan way in the project corridor. the project corridor is our residential neighborhood. after review, i do not believe that the draft eis adequately addresses the option of removal of the viaduct, and not replacing the structure. i believe that this costly project can and should be avoided. the Seattle waterfront would receive a tremendous boost to livability, access, and the opportunity for new development and recreational opportunities without the viaduct in place. the need for accommodating vehicles could best be met through adjustments in existing roadways, and improvements to those existing roadways costing much less than the anticipated project. for this reason, i believe the draft eis is inadequate, and should be revised to consider this alternative. thank you. steve andreasen

493

Comment

Neighborhood connections are the biggest problem in the DEIS for two big reasons 1) Every viaduct replacement option has at least 8 lanes of motorized vehicles on Alaskan Way, leaving less than 30% of the right of way for walkers and 0% for destinations. 2) The neighborhood connection between the Waterfront and Pike Place is denied because the lid over highway 99 doesn't reach Steinbrueck Park (even with the cut and cover tunnel) I strongly believe the cut-and-cover tunnel alternative is the best option, but even it falls short of enabling a great waterfront: - There should be no net increase in roadway to Alaskan Way - Any additional traffic on the surface should be dispersed among all avenues running through the downtown corridor - The lid over SR 99 should extend from Pike to Battery - The trolley on Alaskan Way should be moved to Western to create room for destinations on the waterfront and better neighborhood connections by trolley.

494

Comment

Dear Ms. Ray:

We would like to express our desire that the viaduct be rebuilt in the same configuration as it presently is.

All options over and above the "rebuild" option are, in our opinion, economically unfeasible and will never happen. The dreams of parks and open spaces are luxuries that we cannot afford. Further, the history of estimating of current project, i.e. Light Rail, Monorail, is woeful. We need to stay with a project that will meet our needs and still be within the realm of affordability. It will never happen if you go with any other option.

On a personal note, we use the viaduct all the time to come to Seattle from the south-end. The drive is the most scenic in the State of Washington. Build a tunnel, we won't come. We refuse to become moles.

Sincerely,

Charles and Becky Cox
15725 25th SW
Burien, WA 98166

495

Comment

9688 Rainier Avenue S.
Seattle, WA 98118

May 28th, 2004

Washington State DOT
Attn: Ms. Allison Ray
999 3rd Avenue, Suite 2424
Seattle, WA 98104

Dear Sir/madam:

The Alaskan Way Viaduct rebuild option will have a capacity of some 133,000 ADT along with a surface street capacity of about 10,000 ADT. Over a 20 year life, typical for a simple road user benefit analysis (albeit this is really a structure with an assumed 50-year life) the per vehicle cost, at \$3.2 billion, is in the order of \$.33 per vehicle.

For a tunnel, bypass or otherwise, the ADT ranges from 138,000 to 143,000 with costs at a minimum ranging from \$3.1 billion to \$3.8 billion. These costs over the same 20-year interval are \$0.32 to \$0.27, excluding the costs of ventilation and illumination. The latter are both electricity based and the annual cost of that commodity is huge.

Continuing, in any tunnel option the motorist is denied access to air and light. Even worse, as demonstrated by the cross-Alps tunnel in northern Italy, a fire in a tunnel has deadly consequences. An earthquake in a below sea-level tunnel would be even more problematical. This is compounded since earthquakes are always accompanied by fire.

Any option that even blithely considers a tunnel must be deleted from all further consideration as adverse to the public health, safety and welfare. Life is far too dear to seriously consider such a foolish option. Moreover, the Risk Office of the Office of the Attorney General needs to have greater input since such foolishness will induce tort claims from any motorist who is adversely impacted. That cost is unstated in the DEIS.

Finally, since the most reasonable alternative in terms of cost and capacity is the "Rebuild" option, and since much has been said about its amenity to Seattle, why not include a 20-foot wide "boardwalk" along the upper level of the viaduct so that pedestrians, cyclists and others may have a spectacular and totally unimpeded view of the waterfront from that height. This view is not available with any other option.

Comment

Re: Alaskan Way viaduct and Sea-Wall Replacement Project
DEIS Comments

Dear Ms. Ray,

As a frequent driver on the Alaskan Way Viaduct and being personally impacted by all claustrophobic driving environments, and also being aware that many other drivers are likewise handicapped, I wish to take this opportunity to express my fervent hope that WSDOT and its companion participating agencies will reject any option that includes a new tunnel or a portion of a tunnel for the proposed new SR 99 viaduct.

Ignoring obvious cost impacts associated with any tunnel option, especially recognizing the appalling cost over-runs of Boston's Big Dig, and noting that any tunnel option will deprive me and other citizens of access to air and light, while increasing the driving hazard, you should only consider those options that will allow for our continued driving safety, efficiency, pleasure and ease as well as affording the required necessary future increases in capacity.

I must remind the Department and participating agencies that you do not enjoy an unfettered right to inflict driving problems or related tunnel hazards on me or any other citizen for that matter. Given less expensive alternatives, involving both capitol costs and long term maintenance costs, a tunnel option is not the appropriate choice.

Thank you considering my comments.

Yours sincerely,

Margaret M. Brown, M.A.

Comment

We have observed that neighborhood connections are the biggest problem in the DEIS for at least two reasons:

- Every viaduct replacement option has at least 8 lanes of motorized vehicles on Alaskan Way, leaving less than 30% of the right of way for walkers and 0% for destinations
- The neighborhood connection between the Waterfront and Pike Place is denied because the lid over highway 99 doesn't reach Steinbrueck Park (even with the cut and cover tunnel)

In consideration of these glaring impacts above, we ONLY support the cut-and-cover tunnel alternative as the best option, but even it falls short of enabling a great waterfront - see below:

- There should be no net increase in roadway to Alaskan Way
- Any additional traffic on the surface should be dispersed among all avenues running through the downtown corridor
- The lid over SR 99 should extend from Pike to Battery
- The trolley on Alaskan Way should be moved to Western to create room for destinations on the waterfront and better neighborhood connections by trolley

We do NOT want to see a new or old and repaired viaduct! The tunnel option will give citizens an opportunity to enjoy a great waterfront!

For example, the Boston tunnel is among the most successful revitalization, economic, and traffic management solutions in the US. Only the 'tunnel' will create new open space for people, help us meet growth management goals, strengthen our economic base and maintain current transportation capacity. We also understand that there is an option to shorten the construction time by completely closing the project area to present viaduct traffic - which we believe would be a cost saving measure that could potentially outweigh the increase of disruption from a loss of circulation. Finally, please thoroughly investigate the access to ferries and other transportation modes within your decision making process.

Please take our comments very seriously - this structure will impact our communities for another 50+ years! We must live/work with the negative impacts from construction that will hit the Pioneer Square community hard. As a result, mitigation will be the next discussion topic. This fragile community will be heavily assaulted by the looming construction from the monorail. Pioneer Square's historic landmark status should be "enhanced and optimized" at the end of this project, not "destroyed".

Thank you,

David Vice

13+ Year Pioneer Square Resident / Business Owner
PO Box 4426 / Seattle, WA 98194 - 206-625-0347

498

Comment

The design work being done presently is an opportunity to correct a huge urban planning mistake. As a lifelong Seattleite, I am heartened by the opportunity presented by the decay of the Viaduct, but I am discouraged by the results that have come of the official planning process.

The emphasis on replacing private automobile capacity is simply wrongheaded. Its effect is visible in the shortcomings in the plan. Please remember that this is a once-a-century opportunity to put things right, and remove a huge quality-of-life obstacle from the heart of the city.

Please consider these thoughts:

1. The viaduct needs to come down, whether the city, state or federal government is liable in the case of a structure failure or not is beside the point. It is no longer safe to allow people to risk their lives every day driving on it.
2. There should be no net increase in roadway to Alaskan Way. To do otherwise is to fail to learn from history. Making the waterfront a high traffic corridor was a mistake, please do not make the same mistake twice.
3. Any additional traffic on the surface should be dispersed among all avenues running through the downtown corridor. Studies throughout the world have shown decreased accommodation for the private automobile (reduced parking, restricted rights-of way) results in reduced congestion. People find other ways of getting there. They ride transit, move closer, etc. We are investing billions of dollars in public transit in this decade. Recognizing that large cities will have congestion, why should we continue to degrade the waterfront for the sake of cars when there are so many other ways to get around?
4. The lid over SR 99 should extend from Pike to Battery. Pike Place Market and the Waterfront are two regional jewels, artificially separated years ago by the viaduct. They are a stones' throw apart, but miles away on foot. We have the opportunity to correct that mistake, let's not squander it.
5. The trolley on Alaskan Way should be moved to Western to create room for destinations on the waterfront and better neighborhood connections by trolley. The Western neighborhood character is a great compliment to the trolley. This would change it from a tourist ride to a real component of the general transportation picture, linking Pioneer square to the furniture shops and office buildings on Western to Pike Place Market and residences in Belltown. This is a use of transportation dollars that makes sense, by improving quality of life and moving more people.

499

Comment

I am in support of the Tunnel Alternative that includes the rebuilding of the Seawall. For once let's do the project right since this project has to last the next 100 to 200 years. We are always forced to pick an alternative that is not the best and we end up paying to replace the project before we should be. Do the project right for once. Look at what Boston did with their underground freeway connections and the benefits to the City by removing the freeway and building parks and green space.

500

Comment

3822 NE 97th St.
Seattle, WA 98115

5-29-04

Allison Ray
Alaskan Way Viaduct & Seawall Project Office
999 Third Ave, Suite 2424, Seattle, WA 98104

Subject: New Alaskan Way Viaduct, etc.
Dear Sir,

The Seawall Replacement is a real estate improvement project and has no connection to a Viaduct replacement-improvement program. Secondly the 4 billion dollar figure will quite likely turn into a troubled 10 billion program. These are 2 unrelated deals. A Boston type dream.

A replacement viaduct should be a side-by-side one level roadway. It can be done by shaving roughly 30ft from the West side of old buildings for about 400 feet. The next viaduct should be held to 100,00 cars per day. Automotive toll booths should installed plus booths at any "on" ramp from the business district, even if not used.

I visualize the viaduct as a growing by-pass on travel from Tukwila – Georgetown-E. Marginal Way-Viaduct to Mercer St. mess – Montlake etc. I have used this route for 20 years to avoid downtown freeway mess. As Seattle plans ahead, this is a perfect by-pass.

Before a new 520 Bridge is built, final drawings on the Montlake Bridge mess should be issued, and the Mercer Street project should be finished.

There may be those who want to line Mercer St. with tall buildings and narrow street. Mercer St. west to 5th Ave No. will have to be an unusually wide corridor, with decent building setbacks.

The taxpayers are not going to go for 5 billion dollar over-runs and wild projects. The new Seattle Monorail Project may bring an end to wild engineering ventures with public money.

Sincerely,
Ed Brady

501

Comment

See our comments on the DEIS for the Viaduct below:

We have observed that neighborhood connections are the biggest problem in the DEIS for at least two reasons:

- * Every viaduct replacement option has at least 8 lanes of motorized vehicles on Alaskan Way, leaving less than 30% of the right of way for walkers and 0% for destinations

- * The neighborhood connection between the Waterfront and Pike Place is denied because the lid over highway 99 doesn't reach Steinbrueck Park (even with the cut and cover tunnel)

In consideration of these glaring impacts above, we ONLY support the cut-and-cover tunnel alternative as the best option, but even it falls short of enabling a great waterfront - see below:

- * There should be no net increase in roadway to Alaskan Way

- * Any additional traffic on the surface should be dispersed among all avenues running through the downtown corridor

- * The lid over SR 99 should extend from Pike to Battery

- * The trolley on Alaskan Way should be moved to Western to create room for destinations on the waterfront and better neighborhood connections by trolley

We do NOT want to see a new or old and repaired viaduct! The tunnel option will give citizens an opportunity to enjoy a great waterfront! Only the 'tunnel' will create new open space for people, help us meet growth management goals, strengthen our economic base and maintain current transportation capacity. We also understand that there is an option to shorten the construction time by completely closing the project area to present viaduct traffic - which we believe would be a cost saving measure that could potentially outweigh the increase of disruption from a loss of circulation. Finally, please thoroughly investigate the access to ferries and other transportation modes within your decision making process.

Please take our comments very seriously - this structure will impact our communities for another 50+ years! We must live/work with the negative impacts from construction that will hit the Pioneer Square community hard. As a result, mitigation will be the next discussion topic. This fragile community will be heavily assaulted by the looming construction from the monorail. Pioneer Square's historic landmark status should be "enhanced and optimized" at the end of this project, not "destroyed".

Thank you,

Laine Ross

13+ Year Pioneer Square Resident / Business Owner

PO Box 4426 / Seattle, WA 98194 - 206-293-5045

Comment

My Comments to Waterfront (Viaduct) DEIS:

The design work being done presently is an opportunity to correct a huge urban planning mistake. As a lifelong Seattleite, I am heartened by the opportunity presented by the decay of the Viaduct, but I am discouraged by the results that have come of the official planning process.

The emphasis on replacing private automobile capacity is simply wrongheaded. Its effect is visible in the shortcomings in the plan. Please remember that this is a once-a-century opportunity to put things right, and remove a huge quality-of-life obstacle from the heart of the city.

Please consider these thoughts:

1. The viaduct needs to come down, whether the city, state or federal government is liable in the case of a structure failure or not is beside the point. It is no longer safe to allow people to risk their lives every day driving on it.
2. There should be no net increase in roadway to Alaskan Way. To do otherwise is to fail to learn from history. Making the waterfront a high traffic corridor was a mistake, please do not make the same mistake twice.
3. Any additional traffic on the surface should be dispersed among all avenues running through the downtown corridor. Studies throughout the world have shown decreased accommodation for the private automobile (reduced parking, restricted rights-of way) results in reduced congestion. People find other ways of getting there. They ride transit, move closer, etc. We are investing billions of dollars in public transit in this decade. Recognizing that large cities will have congestion, why should we continue to degrade the waterfront for the sake of cars when there are so many other ways to get around?
4. The lid over SR 99 should extend from Pike to Battery. Pike Place Market and the Waterfront are two regional jewels, artificially separated years ago by the viaduct. They are a stones' throw apart, but miles away on foot. We have the opportunity to correct that mistake, let's not squander it.
5. The trolley on Alaskan Way should be moved to Western to create room for destinations on the waterfront and better neighborhood connections by trolley. The Western neighborhood character is a great compliment to the trolley. This would change it from a tourist ride to a real component of the general transportation picture, linking Pioneer square to the furniture shops and office buildings on Western to Pike Place Market and residences in Belltown. This is a use of transportation dollars that makes sense, by improving quality of life and moving more people.

3015 SW Avalon Way
Seattle, WA 98126
425.605.8369

503

Comment

After reviewing the choices on the wsdot web site I feel there are two choices that are far superior, Arial and Tunnel. I have lived in Seattle my entire life and the Alaskan way viaduct is easily one of my favorite roads, the fresh sea air and views are amazing. I think it might be time to go underground now though; the tunnel plan seems the best. My only fear is the City handing the open space created by the tunnel project to developers. The open space should be public, either a greenbelt or a park or something public. No more condos!

504

Comment

Demolition prior to mitigation/temporary replacement of every traffic lane displaced means, in the aggregate, a long term hit to the economy we can ill afford. Therefore, an option needs to be placed back on the agenda of choices: a temporary (20 - 25 year) north-south SR99 SUSPENSION BRIDGE over Elliott Bay. To fail to study the ramifications of this option puts our economy at risk to dollar figures many more times than the \$1.5b depreciated over the life span of the structure.

505

Comment

The tunnel alternative will create so many opportunities to blend waterfront activities and tourism with downtown and all it has to offer. Views would be enhanced creating higher property tax revenue. More condominiums and other residential projects could result. Restaurants and retail shops would benefit by having a transition area where today is noise and cement. Although it is hard to quantify, the additional cost would be offset by improvements listed above and the revenue they would generate. Seattle must think long term and out-of-the-box like Vancouver, BC.

Comment

Shirley J. Bonney, MSW
 1507 Western Avenue, Suite 603
 Seattle, WA 98101
 May 30, 2004

Ms. Allison Ray
 Alaskan Way Viaduct and Seawall Replacement Project Office
 999 Third Avenue, Suite 2424
 Seattle, WA 98104

SR 99 – Alaskan Way Viaduct and Seawall Replacement Project Draft Environmental Impact Statement Comment – May 30, 2004

I live and work at the Fix Building, which is located at 1507 Western Avenue and is directly adjacent to the Viaduct project site. The Fix Building condominium complex is a mixed use residential/commercial building.

My concerns for the Alaskan Way Viaduct project are as follows:

1. I am deeply concerned about the structural integrity of the existing Alaskan Way Viaduct structure and the seawall, and I implore you to take immediate action to adopt an alternative and move forward with it.
2. I feel that the tunnel alternative is the best alternative of those cited in the EIS. I think it is important that WSDOT preserve an alternate north-south highway corridor between Elliott Bay and Lake Washington and the tunnel allows for that most effectively. The surface alternative does not allow for that at all and the bypass tunnel compromises that capability.
3. The tunnel alternative will also provide the best quality of waterfront experience for residents, businesses and tourists alike. The character and views in the permanent condition will be of great benefit and an incredible improvement over the existing condition. It will be a visual and noise relief to have no aerial structure along the waterfront.
4. Establish a forum for residences and businesses adjacent to the project site to work with the design team to assure that the concerns about construction impacts are met.
5. Noise: Limit construction noise that exceeds the City of Seattle residential nighttime noise regulations to non-residential areas of the project site. Appendix F states that city noise levels are expected to be exceeded in the nighttime and this is not acceptable in a residential area.
6. Traffic: We are concerned about increased traffic on Western Avenue caused by any detours to SR 99. Southbound traffic should be diverted before reaching the Pike Place Market area, perhaps at Broad or Denny Way, thereby preventing additional congestion in the vicinity of Pike Place Market. All changes in traffic need to be clearly identified.
7. Parking: It is necessary for my business to have easily accessible parking for my clients even during all phases of construction.
8. Develop a clear process by which claims for any damage to adjacent properties can be made and fully compensated. Full disclosures of project insurance levels or self insurance of WSDOT should be made.
9. Phase construction adjacent to Fix Building to maintain parking garage exit access onto Alaskan Way. Integrate safe access into final design.
10. Provide adequate dust control during demolition.
11. Develop programs to keep area businesses alive during the project period. Having people continue to access the area shops and restaurants will enhance the safety of the adjacent neighborhoods. Consider mitigating impacts to neighborhood business with a public information campaign.

12. Locate Pike Street Ventilation Building and its stacks someplace other than the Pike Place Market residential area. The EIS needs to address the release of concentrated pollutants and their effect on a residential property directly adjacent to the proposed ventilation stack. What are the effects of constant exposure to the plume from the ventilation building? What type of particulate matter will be released and what are the health risks? Ross Manor and Heritage House are neighborhood homes for the elderly, and many children play in the area and in Pike Place Market Daycare. They should not be exposed to concentrated airborne pollutant levels with the greater associated health risks that would result from the ventilation stacks. The EIS should also address the change in character of the ambient noise resulting from the frequency and steady sound of the fans. These concerns should affect a location for the building to a non-residential area. There are many options further south of the

currently proposed location so it is not located next door to people's homes.

Thank you for your consideration of these matters.

Sincerely,
Shirley J. Bonney, MSW

507

Comment

Thousands of commuters as well as tourists can enjoy great views of our area from the current viaduct as I did over 25 years of commuting to Boeing plants. I see no reason why they should be denied that view just so a relatively small number of property owners can capitalize on their properties if the viaduct is removed. I also doubt that the number of citizens who might use the "improved" waterfront would number more than those commuters. Since the cost of tunneling adds \$2 billion or so to costs I propose that, if the tunneling goes ahead, such added costs should be added to the benefiting property owners taxes, not the general public. I see no reason why we should put up with twice the cost and twice the construction disruption time just so we can ride like moles. When the viaduct was first operated in competition with the I-5 freeway we could tell that the commuters were trying out their alternatives. Some days the freeway was crowded and other days it was not. The same was true of the viaduct. Eventually people settled upon the best choices for themselves and traffic improved on both routes. My point is that without a viaduct for 11 years while installing the tunneled version, traffic would be disastrous. Finally, I have found the current waterfront very enjoyable. I do not need the city to be more "connected" to the water.

508

Comment

Hi my name is Karen Baer, and I live in Seattle at 10742 2nd Ave NW and I do not want a tunnel, I want the Alaskan Way Viaduct replaced as it is. I don't think that this should be an opportunity for developers to make more money and I don't think a tunnel is smart, I think it is just going to just suck up more dollars. It needs to be the least expensive and I think replacement is fast and I would never be able to enjoy the waterfront if Alaskan Way was not there because I would never go there. I am not going to go there for high priced development like is already down there. So, strongly, strongly, strongly against the tunnel and extremely favorable towards simple replacement. Thank you.

509

Comment

I understand the necessity of replacing the viaduct and seawall. However, I am against the alternatives that do not involve another viaduct. My reasons are emotional. I'm sure you've heard this before, but the drive along the top of the viaduct is a major uplifting experience. Much ado is made about how the waterfront will be improved for the people of Seattle if a tunnel is used. But what about the rest of us who don't live downtown? When I drive north on the viaduct, the views of downtown and of the bay and the sound are simply splendid. They always remind me of how great Seattle really is. On a non-rainy, partly sunny day, or especially a sunny day, the view of the late afternoon sky over the sound, with the bay and the waterfront in the foreground, never fails to thrill me as I drive by the downtown buildings of Seattle. And these views have become more precious to me, the more that people have agitated to tear down the viaduct. If you want the non-downtown residents of Seattle to keep a strong connection with the center, then put up another viaduct. Let them keep seeing the city and the bay and having a thrill when they do. On the other hand, don't make them sit down in a tunnel when there is a traffic jam. The jam is much easier to tolerate with the wonderful views from the viaduct. A new viaduct doesn't have to be ugly. Just look at the unbelievable new viaduct over the Tarn River at Millau in France. You are proposing to build something here in Seattle that will probably cost more than the Millau viaduct. Use the money to build a viaduct that isn't ugly and which gives something to each group. For example, you might put it on single pylons, instead of double ones. You might raise it higher. Be creative. One last thought. If you put in a bunch of park areas, especially south of the ferry terminal, those areas will just fill up with homeless people and the like. Look at the park in the Denny Regrade area. And then what? Instead, build the new viaduct higher and open up the waterfront that way.

510

Comment

Daniel E. Klein, MD 1425 Western Avenue, Suite 303 Hillclimb Court Seattle, WA 98101 danielklein@earthlink.net May 30, 2004 Ms. Allison Ray Alaskan Way Viaduct and Seawall Replacement Project Office 999 Third Avenue, Suite 2424 Seattle, WA 98104 SR 99 - Alaskan Way Viaduct and Seawall Replacement Project Draft Environmental Impact Statement Comment - May 30, 2004 I live and work at Hillclimb Court, which is located at 1425 Western Avenue and is directly adjacent to the Viaduct project site. Hillclimb Court condominium complex is a mixed use residential/commercial building. My concerns for the Alaskan Way Viaduct project are as follows: 1. I am deeply concerned about the structural integrity of the existing Alaskan Way Viaduct structure and the seawall, and I implore you to take immediate action to adopt an alternative and move forward with it. 2. I feel that the tunnel alternative is the best alternative of those cited in the EIS. I think it is important that WSDOT preserve an alternate north-south highway corridor between Elliott Bay and Lake Washington and the tunnel allows for that most effectively. The surface alternative does not allow for that at all and the bypass tunnel compromises that capability. 3. The tunnel alternative will also provide the best quality of waterfront experience for residents, businesses and tourists alike. The character and views in the permanent condition will be of great benefit and an incredible improvement over the existing condition. It will be a visual and noise relief to have no aerial structure along the waterfront. 4. Establish a forum for residences and businesses adjacent to the project site to work with the design team to assure that the concerns about construction impacts are met. 5. Noise: Limit construction noise that exceeds the City of Seattle residential nighttime noise regulations to non-residential areas of the project site. Appendix F states that City noise levels are expected to be exceeded in the nighttime and this is not acceptable in a residential area. 6. Traffic: We are concerned about increased traffic on Western Avenue caused by any detours to SR 99. Southbound traffic should be diverted before reaching the Pike Place Market area, perhaps at Broad or Denny Way, thereby preventing additional congestion in the vicinity of Pike Place Market. All changes in traffic need to be clearly identified. 7. Parking: It is necessary for my business to have easily accessible parking for my clients even during all phases of construction. 8. Develop a clear process by which claims for any damage to adjacent properties can be made and fully compensated. Full disclosures of project insurance levels or self insurance of WSDOT should be made. 9. Phase construction adjacent to Hillclimb Court to maintain parking garage exit access onto Alaskan Way. Integrate safe access into final design. 10. Provide adequate dust control during demolition. 11. Develop programs to keep area businesses alive during the project period. Having people continue to access the area shops and restaurants will enhance the safety of the adjacent neighborhoods. Consider mitigating impacts to neighborhood business with a public information campaign. 12. Locate Pike Street Ventilation Building and its stacks someplace other than the Pike Place Market Hillclimb residential area. The EIS needs to address the release of concentrated pollutants and their effect on a residential property directly adjacent to the proposed ventilation stack. What are the effects of constant exposure to the plume from the ventilation building? What type of particulate matter will be released and what are the health risks? Ross Manor and Heritage House are neighborhood homes for the elderly, and many children play in the Hillclimb Court courtyard and in Pike Place Market Daycare. They should not be exposed to concentrated airborne pollutant levels with the greater associated health risks that would result from the ventilation stacks. The EIS should also address the change in character of the ambient noise resulting from the frequency and steady sound of the fans. These concerns should affect a location for the building to a non-residential area. There are many options further south of the currently proposed location so it is not located next door to people's homes. Thank you for your consideration of these matters. Sincerely, Daniel E. Klein, MD

511

Comment

The Aerial Alternative is my preference because: 1) I don't like driving in a tunnel. 2) I enjoy the views while driving on the existing elevated AWV. 3) I like the planned safety improvements to the Battery St tunnel.

512

Comment

Do it once and do it right. Tear down the via-duct, and build a tunnel for traffic. Build a new sea wall. Yes it will cost more, but in the long term, it will beautify the city, eliminate a monolith that divides the city from the waterfront. And, don't waste all the tax payers money on committee after committee. Just do it!!!!!!!

513

Comment

This is the plan I like the best and support this alternative as the more acceptable of those presented to us. However I do not think that any of the plans give enough consideration to the enhancement of the waterfront as a place for people to enjoy and as an attraction for people to make the city their home. Too much attention is given only to moving traffic north and south through the city and too little consideration for the actual waterfront.

514

Comment

I definitely DO NOT SUPPORT rebuilding the viaduct. Were I to have the powers of a dictator, I would go for broke on the project. I would underground the entire length, permitting a great percentage of the traffic to bypass downtown but to access downtown easily at several points. I would replace the present tunnel by lowering it and continuing it underground so that Seattle's street grid could be restored. The outboard wall of the tunnel should be comprised by a reconstructed seawall. Every possible ecologically friendly mitigation should be included. Wherever possible, since this is a state highway, the disruptions to the city should be of paramount concern. At every step, the state should consider Seattle's future as a prime consideration. It's not just about moving traffic--it is about quality of life both as to time saved in traveling, ease of access to the benefits Seattle offers, and reclaiming valuable waterfront to the benefits of the entire city. Whatever is done, it should be much more oriented towards public amenities rather than providing opportunities for wealthy developers to profit. IT MUST BE REMEMBERED THAT, WHILE THE VIADUCT IS A STATE HIGHWAY, IT IS ALSO A MAJOR IN-CITY ARTERIAL. As such, tolling it would be decidedly wrong. I live at the convergence of SR-523 and SR-522 (Lake City/Bothell Way and NE 145th Street) in Seattle. Tolling is being bandied about for SR-520. It should be remembered that, if SR-520 is tolled, SR-522 becomes the only reasonable alternative. This, from experience, leads to all-day-long congestion on SR-522--each time the floating bridge is shut down, it becomes very difficult to use (what are to me) neighborhood streets. If the intent is to further hinder the movement of goods and people around Seattle, all that is necessary is to toll SR-99. A FULL SURFACE solution is COMPLETELY UNACCEPTABLE. THE AERIAL ALTERNATIVE IS LAUGHABLE GIVEN THE PROBLEMS CAUSED BY THE PRESENT VIADUCT--FURTHER, THE COST (WHEN ADDED TO THE COST OF REPLACING THE SEAWALL AS A SEPARATE PROJECT) DOES NOT COMPUTE AS BEING THE BEST USE OF SCARCE FUNDS. THE BYPASS TUNNEL CONCEPT PROVIDES LITTLE IF ANY BENEFIT TO SEATTLE AND MAY MAKE COMMERCE MORE DIFFICULT. In all of this we should keep paramount in our minds what we can do to make the future (and not just the immediate future) better. Are we not supposed to be about providing for our posterity? If so, let us put ourselves in debt for a longer period (let us amortize what we do over a longer time even if we must pay more in the aggregate) that what we do will be more than just a temporary fix. If we do it right, we will be leaving a worthwhile legacy. In replacing the viaduct, we should provide for eventual integration with an underground? solution to the Mercer Mess so as to provide direct linkages between SR-520, SR-99 and I-5. If we do not, it will cost a tremendous amount more in the future. The state should consider providing such linkages as part of the design of the entire system.

515

Comment

Last year There was a proposal by Roger Patten AIA to build a bridge over Elliot Bay to replace the viaduct. It would cost one billion dollars and be completed in 5 years. It takes the noise and traffic away from downtown and creates a beautiful structure to admire along with the mountains and sea and can be done with a minimum of disruption to traffic. You already have the planning done for the approaches. You owe it to the taxpayers to consider a less expensive alternative to tunneling, and rebuilding the viaduct is unacceptable.

516

Comment

This is Patricia Ronhour, 206.243.7417. I live in the South Area in a place known as Seahearth, WA and I use the viaduct regularly. I want the viaduct retrofitted, rebuilt, replaced in the air, pretty much as it is now. It works great it carries many thousands of cars every day, its beautiful from the water and from the City it hurts nothing. It allows the businesses that are already there to function nicely and I feel the tunnel just frees the air to build condos for somebody else and to build more skyscrapers and the inconvenience of the many years it will take to put it in is unbearable. I actually feel that the choice that the Chamber has of putting a tunnel in is far too expensive and we can't afford it. It seems to me for a time the City would pay attention to what they can afford and the people who use the viaduct like it. Thank you

517

Comment

Maureen Sullivan
Urban Project Director
State DOT

RE: A TUNNEL TO REPLACE THE ALASKA VIADUCT

I sent you a letter on January 14, 2003 with brochures about the solution in Gothenborg, Sweden. I believe it will be opened in the first part of 2005.

I was so convinced it would be the answer for us, that I made the point [while I was in southern Sweden] to see the site.

Of the three letters I sent out, you were the only respondent which I very much appreciated. When we have World Class Buildings like the new Library, Benaroya Hall, McCaw Hall AND the Monorail we may be reducing that group who believe is the cheapest way is the best way. We just tore down a city building I was in many times and it was a crackerbox then.

So I applaud that the original DOT belief that the tunnel was the best way.

Building a tunnel will allow the current Viaduct to be used to move the North/South Traffic. To the best of my knowledge none of the other surface plans include the cost of moving traffic through the city [possibly building temporary bridges, etc].

You can help me about the cost of the seawall. For the life of me, why can't the entire tunnel be a part of the seawall with the 'wall' steel driven down lower depths on the west side. The dimensions and weight of the tunnel with the deeper depth of the 'wall' steel should be sufficient.

I most certainly agree with you about the section of Holgate to King streets. It has been awhile since I have driven there, but, I believe Holgate is where the surface of Alaskan Viaduct start to rise. Is it not possible for the surface dive into the tunnel? The construction team in Goteborg did just that so they did not have to create and rise at all. It seems that all cross streets can continue and at some point so will the current Alaska Way for business, shopper, visitors, etc.

I will try to keep abreast by reading the newspapers and if you have a web site I finally have one. It is csvenskj@msn.com. You may reach me there.

A few years back I was speaking on behalf of The Seattle Commons and said that Seattle is in the position of New York City a century ago, only instead of Europeans, it will be all the ethnic Asians. We MUST take that into consideration when we make plans for the future.

I wish you the very best.

Carl R. Johnson
4735 35th Ave NE
Seattle, WA 98105
(206) 525 8412

518

Comment

May 31, 2004

Comment regarding the Viaduct replacement options

From a Seattle Citizen, PO Box 17023, Seattle WA 98127

I am sending in my comments as a matter of conscience. I don't think they'll make any difference to anyone, since minds have clearly already been made up, and there has been extreme lobbying by downtown groups, Allied Arts and others. But I do need to express my thoughts.

I attended two of the open houses. I found that the engineers who were on hand were informative and not biased. The information they presented was excellent.

However, the bias in the overall direction was clear at the open houses.

Slide Show

For example, the open houses featured an elaborate propaganda piece: the well-researched and detailed slide show that showed how views from street level would improve if there were no aerial structure. Where was the comparable slide show that showed the views from a new aerial structure?

Here is how the monorail staff addresses the same question: "Visual impact of the monorail can be viewed from two different perspectives: from the ground as a pedestrian and from the monorail train as a passenger. The pedestrians' perspective from the ground is primarily a negative impact in terms of scale, shade/shadow and view blockage. The perspective from the train would most likely be a positive visual impact giving the passenger a spectacular, constantly changing view of the Seattle skyline and surrounding amenities above the cars, trees and small buildings."

http://66.102/search?cache:oyHGCAaBjfoJ:archives.elevedated.org/project/tech_screening.shtm+%22view+from+the+monorail%22&hl=en

The same prominence should have been given to the views from an aerial viaduct alternative as was given to the views that were shown from ground level in the slide show.

And of course, there was no comparable slide show that showed the awful experience those drivers using the tunnel will experience.

Cost Estimating

In all of the cost estimating that was on display at the open houses, the cost estimating combined the sea wall replacement with the viaduct replacement.

That may be appropriate for the tunnel alternative, which incorporates the sea wall as part of the project.

It is not appropriate to combine the costs in the other alternatives. For example, I understand from talking to one of the engineers at an open house that replacing the sea wall is estimated a \$.5 billion to \$1 billion. That is a separate project and is not a transportation project. While it needs to happen, it is not a viaduct cost, and should not be represented as such. Therefore, the cost to rebuild the viaduct or to do a new aerial viaduct is actually in the \$2.2 billion to \$3 billion range and should be shown in that manner. The sea wall expenses should be shown separately.

Cost Reduction:

The earlier figures for the tunnel ranged up to \$11 billion, and the Mayor was recommending it even at that price, which was laughable. Tremendous effort and research has obviously been invested in finding alternatives to reduce the cost of the tunnel to less than \$4 billion (including the sea wall). This brings it nearly into the same general price range as the other options. Was the same effort put into researching possible ways to reduce the cost of the rebuild or aerial option? The reduction in cost is certainly not as significant as the reduction in the tunnel option. I don't trust that the same energy was invested in exploring ways to reduce the cost of the rebuild or aerial options, and I believe that further cost savings could be found if staff and/or elected officials were sufficiently motivated.

Safety:

It appears that drivers will be expected to feel safe driving in a tunnel that is below sea level, and that is being built by the same people who cannot keep our floating bridges afloat....That is being built by the same people that approved putting water during a construction project into the pontoons that kept the Lake Washington Floating Bridge afloat:

"To control contaminated water, the contractor severed the roadway drains that would have allowed water on the surface of the bridge to flow into the lake. After the drains were cut, essentially all water on the sidewalks and roadway surface of the floating pontoons drained into pontoon cells where it was collected for later removal. To prevent contaminated water from flowing over the side of the pontoons when hydrodemolition was in progress, water-collection barges were moored against the pontoons. The water that was collected in the barges was transferred temporarily into pontoon cells for later removal.

[Http://66.102.7.104/search?q=cache:2YYaDrhfDIwJ:www.sgh.com/technical/papers/tplace.htm+sinking+of+the+floating+bridge&hl=en](http://66.102.7.104/search?q=cache:2YYaDrhfDIwJ:www.sgh.com/technical/papers/tplace.htm+sinking+of+the+floating+bridge&hl=en)

If the tunnel is at least open at the top, drivers could float to the surface.

Transportation Corridor

There are those who would like to stick their heads in the sand, and underestimate the importance of the viaduct in carrying traffic. They advocate not replacing the viaduct and believe the traffic can be absorbed in surface streets, on I-5 and other routes. I am glad I will likely be retired by 2008 and not commuting in that traffic, if that were to occur.

519

Comment

I favor the aerial (first choice) or rebuild (second choice). I totally oppose the tunnel!!!! It is too expensive and would be another "big dig" like the mess in Boston! The most scenic view in Seattle, and the ONLY view that I have of Puget Sound, is from the viaduct as it is currently built when I drive over it. A tunnel will improve the view ONLY of those wealthy enough to have an office in a downtown highrise or who can afford a high rise tunnel. The average citizen deserves a view and deserves a reasonably priced, safe viaduct. If the tunnel option is chosen, then let those groups who advocate for it - raise the funds for it themselves privately. The tunnel is a taxpayer rip off!!!!

520

Comment

The replacement strategy for the existing viaduct should result in no additional surface traffic on Alaskan way. The replacement should be below grade, and should be combined with a new seawall. It would be narrow minded to view the viaduct replacement purely as a transportation project. It would be a huge mistake to ignore the importance of this project to the urban design and quality of life of the most important city in the region. Do not allow traffic engineers and planners to make an above grade solution the preferred alternative based on cost, at the sacrifice of a once in a lifetime opportunity to transform Seattle's waterfront into a vibrant place for visitors and locals of all ages. Seattle's existing waterfront suffers from poor planning and lack of vision. The existing viaduct is an eyesore, a horrible view obstruction, extremely noisy, and hacks the waterfront from a meaningful connection to the City's neighborhoods. Let's provide a replacement below grade, with no net gain in surface traffic, that will accomplish the necessary traffic volume counts, and that will seize on the opportunity transform Seattle into a City with a world class waterfront that can be enjoyed by pedestrians. The project needs to marry the needs of transportation infrastructure with the most intelligent and sensible practices of urban design. The result should include public open spaces along the waterfront, greatly improved pedestrian access along the waterfront, and vastly enhanced connections to the City's neighborhoods. The design solution should encourage new housing, addition of cultural destinations, restored habitat for sea life, promenades, and opportunities for parks that provide direct access to the water. Opportunities to cause such positive change come so rarely. Discover your sense of vision. Shame on planners who should lack the courage, or good common sense, or the conviction to make this happen.

521

Comment

I truly believe the tunnel alternative would be a great asset for our city in the long run. Yes the cost would be larger now but the expense would allow our city to expand and grow in the future. I hope this plan is used and approved by voters, they will realize its long term contribution to the City of Seattle.

522

Comment

Please tally my "vote" for the tunnel alternative. Although it is more expensive, as a Seattle resident, I am willing to shoulder the extra cost for what looks to me to be the best solution. Moving the majority of the viaduct traffic underground, while keeping the current Alaskan Way streets (4 lanes) open to local traffic (downtown, ferries, ballgames, Pioneer Square and Pike Place shopping) while at the same time providing a new seawall is the ultimate solution. If funding is a major issue, my second vote would be for the bypass tunnel alternative, though it makes me uncomfortable to have that additional traffic flowing down Alaskan Way. Thank you for your time, Dascha L. Bright

523

Comment

Members of my household use the viaduct every day - to commute for work by ferry from Seattle to PSNS in Bremerton, for frequent trips to the airport, to access the stadiums, to shop in Pioneer Square, Costco, Esquin, Sears and the home furnishings stores in SODO, and to dine in West Seattle. We SUPPORT minimizing the cost and construction disruption, maximizing capacity and efficiency, retaining the parking under the viaduct, and retaining the view from the viaduct. We STRONGLY prefer the REBUILD Alternative and urge you to select it.

524

Comment

I am writing on behalf of the Owner's Association of Waterfront Landings, a community of approximately 300 residents who live directly on the waterfront. The waterfront is our home. We thank you for the opportunity to comment on the draft EIS. We think the EIS is deficient and/or does not adequately address the following issues: 1. We think that the alternative selected should be based on the shortest construction period and the EIS does not take this into account. 2. Alternatives that are not contingent on maintaining the current traffic flow during construction are not discussed adequately. The EIS seems to focus on only keeping traffic flowing - whether or not that impacts the length of construction time. 3. The EIS does not adequately address how traffic will be diverted or will flow through and around downtown during construction and in what volumes. 4. We would like to see shortened construction periods and minimized traffic detours during construction. This is not adequately discussed in the EIS. 5. The EIS does not address the economic impact in the construction corridor related to reduced property values, loss of businesses, lost tax revenues, reduced revenue from cruise ship patrons, etc. This is a major concern of ours not only from the perspective of reduced property values at Waterfront Landings, but also what impact this will have to vitality of the waterfront and it's businesses. 6. The EIS does not adequately address the displacement of existing parking spaces on and off street, bus staging areas, taxi stands, etc. Sincerely, Elizabeth Kenny President, Waterfront Landings Owner's Association

525

Comment

I am writing to urge you to help take advantage of an incredible opportunity for Seattle. The Alaskan Way Viaduct has cut Seattle off from its waterfront since the 1950's. The end of its useful life offers us a chance to remedy one of the worst urban planning decisions in Seattle's history, and reclaim our connection to Elliott Bay. Other cities around the globe have recognized and remedied similar mistakes, to the current and long-term benefit of their communities. I believe that the City of Seattle and the Central Puget Sound region will be more vital and more successful if we do not build a new highway along Seattle's central waterfront. Improvements to arterial connections and transit would allow us to accommodate Viaduct freight and car traffic while easing congestion for us all, avoid a decade of disruption to businesses and residents, and avoid the billion dollar liabilities of a megaproject. We owe it to ourselves and our children to be rethink the way we provide stewardship to Seattle's waterfront. Therefore, I urge you to work toward the inclusion of a "no-highway" alternative in the Viaduct EIS.

526

Comment

Gary Franklin
2022 12th Avenue South
Seattle, WA 98144

May 31, 2004

Ms. Allison Ray
Alaskan Way Viaduct & Seawall Replacement Office
Suite 2424, 999 Third Avenue
Seattle, WA 98104

Dear Ms. Ray:

Before making a decision on which option to choose to replace the viaduct, we need to be specific on the project goal. Seattle is often ranked as one of the worst cities in the nation for traffic congestion. Improving our traffic flow should be the major goal, and then the choice of opinions, we'll end up with a result that's inadequate in everything...like the joke about the camel – a horse that was designed by a committee. Why spend millions or billions of dollars and not improve the situation.

Some have suggested that an above ground structure is a barrier between the city and waterfront and a tunnel is the answer to provide a "connection". I can think of two types of connection: visual and physical. Removing the viaduct only improves views from buildings immediately adjacent. From First Avenue eastward the waterfront can't be seen due to other buildings. The viaduct doesn't impact their views because most are above the viaduct. The viaduct doesn't hinder physical access because all major streets go under it. If re-timing stop lights and better use of surface streets is truly effective in improving traffic flow then this should be done anyway no matter what replacement option is chosen. To keep our city economically strong we need to make it easier for people to arrive, to get around, and to leave. Try this. Stand on the waterfront and ask yourself how much more of downtown could be seen without a viaduct? The answer is virtually nothing, and that's how much more waterfront could be seen from downtown without a viaduct. Where is any improved "connection"?

No one ever mentions one of the biggest barriers to accessing the waterfront and that's the train traffic. Even spending billions on a tunnel won't eliminate the railroad.

Finally, the best view of the waterfront is from the viaduct.

Please support replacement of the viaduct with a new one. Other more expensive options don't offer correspondingly significant benefits.

A viaduct is:

- Cost/benefit effective
- Efficient in moving traffic
- Short construction time
- Least disruptive to waterfront and businesses during construction
- Saves budget to apply toward seawall

Sincerely,

Gary Franklin
(53 year resident of Seattle)

Comment

May 31, 2004 Washington State Department of Transportation Alaskan Way Viaduct Project Office Subject: Alaskan Way Viaduct Replacement Draft EIS Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this Draft EIS Alternatives I find the analysis provided in this Draft EIS and the technical appendixes generally to be quite thorough, however, there are many cases where the analysis in the Draft EIS appears designed to support the alternatives under consideration, rather than provide a broad view of the function of the transportation system. The choice of alternatives I find especially lacking in providing a logical, more effective, and likely less expensive alternative: improvements to Interstate 5 which parallels State Route 99 at a distance of about a mile through most of the corridor. The recent initiation of by WSDOT of a comprehensive study of Interstate 5 through most of the City of Seattle provides an opportunity to examine these two parallel facilities and determine what package of integrated improvements provides the best transportation system at the best price. The Seattle Daily Journal of Commerce reported on April 14, 2004 that the Washington Department of Transportation is initiating a consultant contract is valued at between \$5 million and \$7 million to look at "any way we can to improve the facility, including capacity additions, pricing and HOT (high-occupancy toll) lanes." It appears from the transportation modeling in the Transportation Discipline Report for the Alaskan Way Viaduct Draft EIS that 2030 traffic volumes on I-5 will be about 30% greater than at present. Given present capacity constraints on I-5, it appears that several billion dollars of improvements may be needed. This further highlights why WSDOT needs to look at all the major freeways in the Seattle area and develop an integrated plan that meets all future transportation needs in a cost effective manner. The piecemeal approach of the current Alaskan Way Viaduct replacement project The major deficiency of the EIS is the lack of consideration of alternatives that would preserve the same mobility functions provided by the viaduct on other corridors. The problem with the approach to the viaduct is that the focus is on replacing the facility rather than the transportation mobility functions. As I outlined in previous emails to WSDOT, the alternative of making improvements the I-5 corridor preserves all of the functions of the Alaskan Way Viaduct for through traffic and has a number of advantages. The I-5 alternative was advanced in my comments to the viaduct project team on July 31, 2002, June 17, 2002 and January 10, 2002, to which I received responses from Carol Hunter on August 6, 2002, June 28, 2002 and January, 2002. To summarize features of such an alternative: 1) I-5 has a much wider right-of-way and has considerable potential for carrying additional through lanes without additional right-of-way, but with more efficient use of the existing corridor. (Included in my June 17, 2002 comment to WSDOT) 2) Both north and south of downtown, adding lanes to the existing elevated structure is relatively straightforward (Included in my June 17, 2002 comment to WSDOT) 3) In the existing corridor, the most constricted area between Columbia Streets and Pine Street can be increased in capacity either by a lower level under the existing lanes (similar to the 3 to 4 lane lower level express lanes between Mercer and Pine) or through adding collector-distributor lanes under the parallel surface streets on either side. (Included in my June 17, 2002 comment to WSDOT) 4) Construction of a tunnel or lower level on I-5 through downtown would be shorter than any of the Alaskan Way tunnel options. (Included in my June 17, 2002 comment to WSDOT) 5) 5) Improvements on I-5 have greater regional benefits because: a) I-5 connects to the entire regional freeway system; b) Improvements can include the Mercer to SR 99 and Spokane Street Viaduct to permanently enhance those weak links of the circulation system. (Included in my June 17, 2002 comment) 6) Construction of a tunnel or lower level in the existing I-5 right-of-way would be less complex because of a number of factors: (Included in my June 17, 2002 comment) a) WSDOT currently controls the entire right-of-way and can manage its use during construction with no conflict from other users. b) b) There are no adjacent businesses to be affected during construction. c) The geotechnical conditions are much better than the unconsolidated fill along the waterfront. d) The removal of thousands of piles is not required. e) The tunnel or lower level would not be at or below sea level, as are the lower levels of the tunnels on the waterfront. f) The management of existing traffic will be more straightforward than along the waterfront because construction can be staged to close lanes during non-peak periods and traffic can be temporarily constricted to a few lanes in each direction. (In addition, the existing one-lane through express lane under the northbound lanes can be expanded to two-lanes by elimination of the Seneca Street off-ramp and modification of existing supports. This would provide a two lane bypass when the southbound mainline needs to be closed temporarily closed for lower level construction. Construction of a lower level beneath the northbound lanes would occur after the lower level beneath the southbound lanes was completed, allowing traffic to be re-routed.) 7) The advantages of improvements to I-5 must be evaluated from the perspective of the current design flaws. I-5 has 12 lanes at the Ship Canal Bridge (including express lanes) and only 8 lanes (including one through express lane) at Madison Street. It has a total of 14 lanes at Jackson Street. Even more striking, the northbound lanes after the I-90 merge total 8 lanes at Jackson then narrow to 3 at Madison. Merely correcting this constriction may be enough to carry a substantial portion of the through traffic that would use the Viaduct. (Included in my June 17, 2002 comment) 8) SR 99 can continue to carry substantial volumes of traffic to and from the downtown without the aerial or tunnel connection along Alaskan Way. (Included in my June 17, 2002 comment). The Draft EIS on page 58 states that "Expanding I-5 is not considered as a replacement for the viaduct because it would not meet the purpose and need of the project. In addition, these concepts would not replace the seawall; so a separate seawall construction project would still be needed." I have reviewed the Purpose and Need statement and find no transportation related goal that the package of improvements outlined above would not meet. What specific consideration was given in the development of alternatives that provided capacity for through movements served by the viaduct on I-5? Did that consideration include detailed modeling? If so, how many additional lanes on I-5 would be required to accommodate through traffic (assuming that the existing SR 99 route to downtown would provide access from the south to at least King Street and from the north to the south portal of the Battery Street tunnel, and that a surface route would be available along the Alaskan Way surface street between Broad Street and Atlantic Street)? What responsibility does WSDOT and FHWA have in participating in the replacement of the seawall, in the absence of a state highway adjacent to it? What justification is there for combining seawall replacement in the transportation project if alternate locations for the state highway can be developed to serve through traffic? Previous responses to my comments indicated that the viaduct is vital to freight mobility. It is true that the viaduct connects the Duwamish area and the Ballard/Interbay areas. This, fact, however does not establish that the viaduct is a major freight route. The following factors mitigate against the viaduct playing a significant role in freight mobility. a) Most of the Duwamish industrial area doesn't connect easily with the viaduct. The only access points are at First Ave/RR Way and south of the Spokane Street Viaduct. At other locations, access is cut off by rail yards and other obstructions. (Included in my July 31, 2002 comments). b) There are other multiple access points connecting the Duwamish industrial area to the regional transportation system and I-5 which are much easier to access than the viaduct and connect to regional destinations which are important to freight mobility. (Included in my July 31, 2002 comments) c) There are few reasons for freight trips from the Duwamish industrial area to travel north on the viaduct, as compared to other regional destinations. The Ballard/Interbay industrial areas are very small compared to other industrial centers in Renton, in the Green River Valley, and on the east side of Lake Washington. (Included in my July 31, 2002 comments). d) The Viaduct is only about a mile and a half of the route from the Duwamish area to Ballard/Interbay which is about 5 miles long. The rest of the route is over surface arterials. Providing surface arterial access for freight on the Alaskan Way surface street would not significantly increase travel

time. (Included in my July 31, 2002 comments) e) For Ballard/Interbay, the Alaskan Way Viaduct is only one of several truck routes. Both Leary Way and Nickerson provide access to Dexter and Mercer Street which provides access to I-5 for regional trips. These routes provide better connections to I-5 and the regional road network

than the Alaskan Way viaduct. (Included in my July 31, 2002 comments) f) The Alaskan Way Viaduct does not connect effectively to the regional freight network. The viaduct connects only to the Duwamish area, West Seattle, and the Burien area. There are no ramps connecting SR 99 to Spokane Street eastbound to I-5. A very small proportion of total trips from Ballard/Interbay are likely to use the viaduct. (Included in my July 31, 2002 comments) g) Ballard/Interbay is a specialized industrial areas focused mostly on the marine industry. There is no reason to assume that trips from Ballard/Interbay are particularly oriented to the Duwamish area. In fact, the Ballard/Interbay area is more likely oriented to specialty industrial supplies outside the region who access via I-5 and would not use the Alaskan Way Viaduct. (Included in my July 31, 2002 comments) h) The Port of Seattle facilities on Harbor Island have no reason to use the viaduct except for trips to north Seattle or Ballard. Again, The Draft EIS and Transportation Discipline Report (TDR) contains no survey or other information about freight traffic accessing these facilities and whether their destinations are such that they can effectively use the viaduct. (Included in my July 31, 2002 comments) i) Port facilities in interbay are bulk facilities such as grain terminals and fish processing uses. It is unlikely that they use the viaduct much. If they do, it is a short part of the trip and use of the surface route would not affect trip time significantly. (Included in my July 31, 2002 comments) On page 34 the Draft EIS states that "A working viaduct and seawall are critical to international and interstate freight and commerce through the Puget Sound region. Failure of the viaduct and seawall would push 110,000 vehicles per day (enough to fill two freeway lanes in each direction) onto already overwhelmed parallel freeways and arterials. This could increase congestion by nearly 40 percent. The congestion could severely affect the ability to move freight and goods across the country and to Canada. The seawall also supports the main rail line in the region, which serves both north- south and east- west freight and passenger service. On page 35 the Draft EIS says "SR 99 is an important alternative route to, from, and through downtown. It is a major freight corridor providing access for businesses in the SODO and Duwamish industrial areas to northwest Seattle neighborhoods. The corridor is an important route for freight in the Ballard/Interbay manufacturing and industrial area. WSDOT classifies this section of SR 99 as a freight corridor carrying more than 10 million tons per year - the highest classification made. Page 40 of the Draft EIS discusses the employment and trip generation of the Interbay/Ballard and Duwamish Industrial areas and suggests, by the context, that the viaduct is important to those areas. Portions of these statements are manifestly incorrect, in other places they are contradicted by more balanced analysis in the Transportation Discipline Report. If the viaduct were not available, only the through component of traffic would be shifted to I-5. Unfortunately we don't know what this is, because the Draft EIS does not tell us. We know that the 110,000 vehicle trips applies to only a five block portion of the viaduct between King Street and Seneca Street. The volumes drop rapidly both north and south to about 80,000 south of King Street and about 60,000 through the Battery Street tunnel. A realistic estimate of the through traffic on the viaduct is probably about 40,000 vehicles per day. The existing SR 99 route for traffic accessing downtown from the south and the north would still be available. A number of alternative routes would be available for traffic to and from Ballard/Interbay. In terms of freight, as outlined above, the viaduct is virtually inaccessible to the Duwamish area except by a single on-ramp and off ramp that carries relatively small truck volumes. Almost none of the marine cargo uses the viaduct. More detailed information is presented in the TDR, however this section of the Draft EIS, by presenting this information, suggests that it is relevant to the function of the viaduct. Why is the 110,000 trips represented in the Draft EIS as being shifted to I-5? Is the EIS writing unaware of the origin and destination of trips, or is this an attempt to create panic? Why is great detail on freight generation included in the Draft EIS without presenting the fact that very little of the total freight generation of these areas uses the viaduct? What is the daily and PM peak hour total volume using the viaduct that originates north of the Battery street tunnel and has destinations a) to downtown Seattle between Denny Street and Royal Brougham Way, b) to West Seattle, c) to the off-ramp to Harbor Island? d) to designations between Spokane Street and the Duwamish River, e) to SR 509 south of the Duwamish River, f) to SR 99 south of the Duwamish River? What is the daily and PM peak hour total volume using the viaduct that originates south of the Duwamish River and has destinations a) to downtown Seattle between Denny Street and Royal Brougham Way and east of Battery Street b) to the Belltown area south of Denny Way and west of Battery Street, c) to Elliott Avenue north of Denny Way d) between the Battery Street Tunnel and the Ship Canal Bridge e) north of the Ship Canal Bridge? What is the daily and PM peak hour FREIGHT volume using the viaduct that originates north of the Battery street tunnel and has destinations a) to downtown Seattle between Denny Street and Royal Brougham Way, b) to West Seattle, c) to the off-ramp to Harbor Island? d) to designations between Spokane Street and the Duwamish River, e) to SR 509 south of the Duwamish River, f) to SR 99 south of the Duwamish River? What is the daily and PM peak hour FREIGHT volume using the viaduct that originates south of the Duwamish River and has destinations a) to downtown Seattle between Denny Street and Royal Brougham Way and east of Battery Street b) to the Belltown area south of Denny Way and west of Battery Street, c) to Elliott Avenue north of Denny Way d) between the Battery Street Tunnel and the Ship Canal Bridge e) north of the Ship Canal Bridge? What other Washington State highways are classified as a freight corridor carrying more than 10 million tons per year? What order in magnitude is the viaduct in comparison to other Washington State highways are classified as a freight corridor carrying more than 10 million tons per year? What is the highest FHWA classification of Freight carrying highways and how does the viaduct compare with that classification? What is the total estimated daily Freight trips and tonnage generated by the Ballard/Interbay and Duwamish industrial areas? What percentage of trips and total tonnage is carried by the viaduct? Addressing these questions will to some extent repair the misconceptions furthered by the DEIS text. Previous responses to my comments also indicated that the viaduct is vital to access to the ferry system. The viaduct, however, provides access to the Ferry System only for trips originating in North Seattle. The trip volumes on SR 99 drop drastically to the north. I find it very doubtful that a significant proportion of trips on the ferries uses the viaduct. From the Draft EIS and Transportation Discipline Report (TDR), it appears that no surveys of cars and trucks boarding the ferry to see what proportion used the viaduct for access. (Included in my July 31, 2002 comments) As indicated above, the recent initiation of by WSDOT of a comprehensive study of Interstate 5 through most of the City of Seattle provides an opportunity to examine these two parallel facilities and determine what package of integrated improvements provides the best transportation system at the best price. The Draft EIS states that "Other Features of the Alternatives concepts such as adding ramps at specific locations (like S. Spokane Street to Fourth or Sixth Avenues), extending the AWW Corridor to I-5 or SR 520, and providing grade separation in specific areas. These ideas are not evaluated in this Draft EIS because many of them could be built as separate projects or they are marginally related to the purpose of this project and therefore could not be logically included. There are two design features included in the Draft EIS that could be built as separate projects, are marginally related to the purpose and should be eliminated. In addition, these features obscure the functional impacts of the viaduct alternatives and add costs that inflate the true cost of the alternatives for meeting the regions transportation needs. These features which should be eliminated are: a) options for crossing SR 99 north of the Battery Street Tunnel, and b) relocating the SR 99 surface highway west of the rail yards south of Holgate Street. The inclusion in the alternatives of east-west crossing of SR-99, specifically the Mercer Street Underpass options that include significant changes to east-west crossings of SR 99 appears to not meet the purpose and need of the project. These options bear little or no relation to the replacement of

the viaduct. The elimination of 4 lanes of traffic crossing under Aurora Avenue using Broad Street and replacing them by two additional lanes on Mercer Street will have pervasive changes on traffic circulation and operations. Including these features provides a confounding factor that make it impossible to determine the effects of the

alternatives for viaduct replacement for the area north of Denny Way. It is likely that changes in east-west traffic patterns with resulting changes in intersection demand characteristics, especially left-turn demand confounds an accurate comparison of effects of the viaduct replacement alternatives. In addition, this features appears to benefit only the development interests in the South Lake Union Area and perhaps the City of Seattle has no relevance to the transportation goals of WSDOT, and adds cost to the alternatives in which it is included that skews the decision-making process. In addition, if these east-west crossing alternatives are to be properly analyzed, the analysis area needs to extend to the entire corridor from Elliott Avenue to I-5 where traffic patterns will be changed. What is the increase in east-west traffic on Denny Way and other east-west connections, as a result of viaduct alternatives with no change in east-west crossings of SR 99? What is the change in levels of service at intersections north of the Battery Street Tunnel as a result of viaduct alternatives with no change in east-west crossings of SR 99? The second feature that bears little or no relation to the purpose and need of the project is moving the SR 99 right of way to the west south of Holgate Street. This features appears to benefit only the railroads and perhaps the Port of Seattle by allowing a larger railroad classification yard. It has no benefits for vehicular transportation. It is a substantial expense that is proposed to be borne by the public which receives no direct benefit. What benefit to transportation circulation is provided by relocating the SR 99 right-of-way to the west of the existing route south of Holgate Street? What is the cost of the alternatives without relocation of SR 99 south of Holgate? As indicated above, these features of the alternatives should be eliminated for the reasons given in DEIS, they can be implemented independently of the replacement of the viaduct and bear little relevance to the purpose and needs of a state highway.

Transportation Analysis The description of the function of the Alaskan Way Viaduct in the Transportation Discipline Report (TDR) in Appendix C reflects a pervasive confusion about the role of the Alaskan Way Viaduct. (I refer to the "viaduct" as the elevated roadway between Holgate Street and the Battery Street Tunnel.) The TDR includes the following: "State Route 99 (SR 99) is an important highway facility that serves both local and regional travel demands in the central Puget Sound area" (TDR, p. 1). What is meant by a regional trip? What is the percent of regional trips on the viaduct? What is the percent breakdown of designations for regional trips? What is meant by a local trip? What is the percent of regional trips on the viaduct? What is the percent breakdown of designations for regional trips? The methodology of establishing 2030 trips appears unusual. I would expect modeled existing trips to be compared with future modeled trips and a growth rate applied to each intersection approach or ramp. The TDR states "Growth rates were established for ramp locations considering both the modeled growth forecast for the area served by the ramps, as well as the growth forecast for mainline traffic and area-wide for the portion of the network served." (TDR p. 15) What weight was given each of these factors? How does this methodology take into consideration trip choice based on capacity of other elements of the transportation system and the desired end point of trips? The methodology for arterials and intersections were based on "an evaluation of sub-area and screenline growth forecasted by the AWV model" (TDR p. 16) How does use of screen lines provide a means to allocate growth between individual arterials? For example, how can you determine how north-south trips split between 1st, 3rd and the 2nd/4th Avenue pair? How does this methodology take into consideration trip choice based on capacity of other elements of the transportation system and the desired end point of trips? For example, how does this account for "local" trips shifting from SR 99 to local arterials based on congestion? The initial step of establishing future traffic volumes for the SR 99 mainline at the Battery Street Tunnel appears flawed by estimating volumes substantially higher than the capacity of the facility. The Battery Street Tunnel is substandard by today's standards with a very tight turn near each end. It lacks shoulders on the side and center. The 2030 estimated PM peak hour northbound volume of 4050 (TDR Figure 4-9) is 2025 vehicles per lane and appears substantially beyond the capacity of the roadway. This is reflected in calculations on page 26 that capacity of the Battery Street Tunnel is 1,900 people. That figure seems high given the geometrics of the tunnel. In addition the v/c results on TDR figure 5-19 that indicate the tunnel operating at over capacity, which is likely to be either impractical, or dangerous, or both. How was the capacity of the Battery Street Tunnel calculated? If traffic assigned is assume at a lower capacity, what is the shift of traffic to arterials and I-5? The measures of transportation system operation appear flawed in a number of cases and lack relevance or needed information to judge the alternatives from the perspective of operation of the regional transportation system.

MOE H2: Corridor Peak Hour Travel Times The choice of routes to measure travel time appears flawed. Page 24 of the TDR provides the following destinations and route: Between downtown Seattle and the Aurora Bridge This route extends from the center of downtown Seattle (within a one-block radius of Second Avenue and Madison Street) to just south of the Aurora Bridge on the north side of Queen Anne hill. The route does not utilize SR 99 through downtown, as access to/from the north is not provided from downtown. Instead, the route follows First Avenue and Battery Street (northbound) and Wall Street and Second Avenue (southbound) through downtown. Access to SR 99 is at the Denny ramps, and the route follows SR 99 north of there. Using 1st Avenue for this route makes little sense. 1st Avenue is not near the center of downtown and is a two-way roadway with turning conflicts at intersections. As such it is a much slower and more congested route than 4th Avenue. 2nd Avenue and 4th Avenue have been a high capacity arterial pair providing access through downtown since the 1950s. Since they are both one-way streets with coordinated signals, they provide very efficient vehicle movement. I have timed the trip on these streets at rush hour a number of times and find that the trip time from Madison to the SR 99 ramps at Denny Street is about 5 minutes. This route is likely to be much less congested in the future because of the lack of conflicting turn movements at intersections and signal coordination that is possible on a one-way pair. Why was 1st Avenue chosen for this route? What are the trip times if 2nd Avenue and 4th Avenue are used instead?

MOE H3 and H4: SR 99 Corridor PM Peak Hour Vehicle and Person Throughput provides a flawed perspective of system operation because it considers only SR 99. It is of little consequence if the number of vehicles and persons carried on one corridor is reduced if the capacity of the system is adequate. This is a case where analysis of the alternative of increasing capacity on I-5 is especially relevant.

MOE H5: Corridor Peak Hour Volume to Capacity Estimates appears fatally flawed in comparing the surface alternative to others. Because the methodology is different, the results are not comparable. In addition, the following anomalies are noted in questions below. How can the v/c ratio of 1.35 reported for the Surface Alternative in TDR Table 5-18 be relevant if the intersection v/c ratios as reported in TDR Table 5-34 range from .98 to 1.21? Is not intersection capacity generally the relevant measure of capacity on a street with signalized intersections?

MOE H8: Traffic Distribution is designed to gauge the general impacts to parallel streets and highways. As described in Section 5.3.7 (TDR p 169f) the analysis is essentially meaningless for two reasons: a) It is based on ADT, which has no bearing on capacity and b) volume shifts to other corridors are not compared to capacity. In addition, reporting the shifts in traffic between the alternatives in ADT makes it impossible to clearly relate the changes in on travel time and congestion, which are based on the PM peak to the shift to alternative routes. It is critical, for example to relate the shift to I-5 for the Surface Alternative to the PM peak hour capacity of I-5. It may be necessary to propose capacity improvements to I-5 as part of the mitigating measures for the Surface Alternative. What are the PM peak hour shifts in traffic distribution? How do those shifts relate to capacity of the facilities?

MOE H9: Arterial Intersection Performance has the potential to indicate the impacts of the alternatives, but has been rendered meaningless because of the limited scope of the analysis. The analysis extends only to 2nd Avenue. This provides a very limited

view of the effects of traffic re-distribution. It excludes the 4th Avenue 2nd Avenue arterial pair that provide the highest capacity routes for northbound and southbound traffic through the downtown because they are one-way streets with coordinated signals. This doesn't give an accurate view of travel through the downtown utilizing

available alternative routes when capacity on SR 99 is limited. In addition, there are a number of anomalies in LOS and v/c ratios reported as noted below. The screenlines used in MOE H8 extend all the way from the waterfront to I-5, why weren't intersections analyzed for the same area? Why does 2nd/Madison experience 144 seconds delay in 2030 Existing Facility and much less in other alternatives? Why does the delay at different intersections on Second Avenue vary? Was the analysis performed assuming coordinated signals? (With coordinated signal operation, as at the present time, southbound traffic should platoon through intersections with approximately the same delay would be produced on 2nd Avenue by the signal coordination at each intersection. Any difference in delay would be attributed entirely to the cross street delay. If so, this should be reported because a delay in cross street traffic for the relatively short trips between 2nd Avenue and the I-5 interchanges is different in character and much different for operation of the circulation system than delays to north-south traffic platooning with coordinated signals.) Was analysis on First Avenue performed assuming left-turns allowed at cross streets, particularly the current signal timing at Pike Place? Why were two lanes in each direction assumed on First Avenue rather than the existing configuration? Would it not be more consistent to identify impacts with the existing conditions and identify additional lanes as mitigation. Is a four lane First Avenue consistent with City of Seattle plans for Pioneer Square? What is the source of traffic on First Avenue? Can that traffic be reasonably

528

Comment

On the selection of alternatives:

Whatever is decided, it is absolutely imperative that the 99 corridor continue to exist as a rapid means of accessing downtown Seattle and going through to the South or North. This, of course includes easy access to W. Seattle, Seatac, etc. This is essential given the difficulties on the I-5 corridor. Also, for residents to the west of I-5 living in the city, Aurora Ave is usually a better route.

The rapidity of access must not be compromised by becoming a road interrupted by lights or stops. The number of access points should be carefully considered and limited. It should be constructed so that highway speeds are able to be maintained on the route.

As a property owner in the city, I feel I'm on the receiving end of an endless progression of property tax hikes for an infinite list of projects planned to be done. This one is essential - maybe some others aren't.

Thank you for the chance to comment-

5/31/03

Peter Comanor

3821 Carr PI N

Seattle, WA 98103-8125

206-632-0918 (voice mail)

529

Comment

Victor O. Gray

Civil and Structural Engineer

120 Colman Drive

Port Townsend, We. 98368

email vgray @Olympus.net

5/30/04

360-379-9862

WSDOT.
999 Third Avenue S. Suite 2424
Seattle, WA. 98104

Re Alaskan Way Viaduct and Seawall Replacement Project DEIS.

The WSDOT has produced a major document for the DEIS. A three volume summary with about 450 pages in the 11 by 17 format backed up by 23 appendices in the 8.5 by 11 format with more than 2400 pages of data. Just taking the time to review all of the data requires a major effort not to mention trying to develop some constructive comments.

The DOT is well aware we have followed closely the project in its development over the last 3 years. We have suggested some alternates that might be considered. However the five selected alternatives ignores our views and are presented as the last word and the only possible solution for the entire project. This is in spite of the fact that the financing, 2.5 to 4.1 billion, to support any of the alternatives simply is not available and the time table proposed is unrealistic.

In our concern about costs we have suggested that the seawall work could be done independent of the viaduct. The soils below the viaduct can be stabilized independent of the wall. We also note that the work scheduled for north of the Battery Street Tunnel could be deferred and done independently as the safety of the viaduct is not involved. The viaduct single level structure north of Pine Street could be retrofitted and strengthened as noted in the rebuild alternative. That leaves the two level structure south of Pine street to be upgraded or replaced.

We proposed a system to provide for base isolation together with seismic dampers to protect the two level structure against a earthquake. That proposal was considered and dismissed by the DOT. Still there are other options available that should be investigated with the same zeal as those of the five alternatives. Specifically we suggest that the viaduct can be braced to meet the new more rigorous earthquake standards. Together with ground improvement the new braced frames can provide the necessary lateral strengthening while the existing structure can support the vertical loads even with some damage as now exists. It should be noted that during the 2001 earthquake only about one block or 2 three span viaduct units out of 64 were damaged. Our proposed braced frame alternate can be done while keeping the viaduct in service. We call this a repair alternative/strengthen proposal.

Some observations of the five proposed alternatives are in order. In all of the alternates it is assumed that the money will be there at the time it is needed. Given the status of the funding at this time and the vulnerability of the viaduct structure time is not on the side of just waiting until something happens. Further all of the alternates involve a loss in traffic capacity over a period of years during construction. Appendix "C" Transportation Discipline Report, cites a loss of 51% up to 82% during the most disruptive stage. Even those figures may be low considering the assumptions made. See appendix "C" page 267. If anything the loss in capacity will be greater than estimated.

Considering the loss of capacity, even using the average of about 25% (varies with each alternate as per table 6.7 appendix "C") that translates into some 28000 trips per day that will be diverted from the viaduct corridor to I 5 and other remaining streets. Just where the traffic will go and how much delay and cost to the motorist needs to be quantified when considering alternates. Also the ferry system will be disrupted thru out each day with all of the alternates. Again that will cause more delays and costs to all of the users of the ferries. Some 45 scheduled landings and 45 departures occur during a typical weekday. This involves some 7700 vehicles. Those delay costs should also be quantified.

All of the proposed alternatives will have a severe impact on the businesses that now exist on the waterfront. Somehow the DEIS assumes that they will survive during the extended period or years of construction. How the public will access those facilities as well find a place to park not to mention how normal deliveries can be made. The

DEIS is inadequate with respect to the waterfront activities as well as maintaining truck traffic and emergencies services thru the corridor.

Recommendations:

Break the project down into separate units for cost control. Delete the work north of the BST tunnel. Separate the seawall work.

Do a study of the repair strengthened braced frame with viscous dampers as an alternate for the two level structure. Note that this would be a minor cost and involve a short period of time and would allow a construction cost estimate to be made. The study should be performed by an independent engineering firm with a given directive to find a solution to repair the viaduct.

Strengthen the single level structure north of Pine Street.

Do a survey of the costs to the public of the loss of capacity for each of the alternates. This should include the travel time costs and any off corridor projects that would be necessary.

In the overall assessment of the project include the capacity lost cost with the construction costs for each alternative.

After all is said and done, with the 5 now proposed alternatives, the public will be forced to find ways to work around the congestion on Alaskan Way. And as noted in the report this will go on for some years. Who knows, the public may just manage to survive with out the need of a project costs in billions.

Sincerely,

530

Comment

The plan for to rebuild the viaduct is short-sighted. There needs to be a better review of how to use alternative transportation and routes to build a city that celebrates it's waterfront and downtown neighborhoods and not another large highway that cuts the city in half.

531

Comment

I would like to ensure that the full tunnel is the selected alternative for replacing the Alaska Way Viaduct and Seawall. The full tunnel will improve connectivity with greater downtown and bring greater economic and civic vitality to the waterfront.

532

Comment

The closure of the viaduct after the earthquake did not bring the City to a standstill - and that was not a planned closure. The cost of replacement in kind is enormous and the cost of a tunnel deep enough to remove the barrier, even more so. I think that at a fraction of the cost, and with potentially more interested parties to contribute funds, I-5 through the downtown area can be improved and select side streets can be improved and synchronized to move traffic. If there is a fall-off of efficiency, the trade-off would be a downtown waterfront connected to The City, a huge amount of land to be developed (bounty to the coffers)all gained while eliminating the noise, smell, and view-blocking hulk of the viaduct. As a Magnolia resident, I love the convenience of the Viaduct. It is the only way I have gotten to the airport and other points south of the city since 1989. I would trade this efficiency in a minute for a decision that would cost less and would give improving Seattle's waterfront for people priority over getting traffic around downtown via a part-buried tunnel or viaduct at the edge of our bay.

533

Comment

Please consider the Environmental Impact of taking down the viaduct and not replacing it. Instead spend the money to repair the seawall and improve traffic on the surface streets of Seattle.

534

Comment

As a property owner on the Seattle Waterfront, I would like to point out several items that need to be addressed in the EIS. First, there is not adequate discussion of the economic impacts to businesses and residents during the construction process, including lost property values, loss of business and businesses, lost tax revenues, and the reversal of the efforts of the past two decades' of the Port Of Seattle's waterfront rejuvenation efforts. Specifically, the impacts of the temporary bypass and flyover options appear to have the largest impact over a very long period, but receive only cursory acknowledgment that there will be negative impacts. I believe these impacts should be estimated and included in the costs when considering plan alternatives. Second, there is no mention of alternatives that do not maintain the current traffic flow during construction, nor is there mention of alternatives that would divert traffic through or around other areas downtown rather than the waterfront. A different approach could reduce both the construction time and cost of the project. Also, a different approach would prevent the waterfront residents and businesses from unfairly bearing the full burden of maintaining traffic flow and enduring the impacts of the actual project construction. Third, no alternative is considered to replace the viaduct's traffic capacity with multiple facilities, instead of a single highway. This may be an opportunity for a more economical solution and to convert the waterfront from a highway to more desirable uses.

535

Comment

The EIS needs to analyze what is likely the simplest, cheapest, and least disruptive solution -- first improve the larger transportation network instead of building a new highway.

536

Comment

The EIS needs to analyze what is likely the simplest, cheapest, and least disruptive solution -- fixing the larger transportation network instead of building a new highway. Let's keep in mind what a lovely city Portland is and what a wonderful job they have done managing their downtown waterfront. It is a shining example of a pedestrian-friendly city that accommodates traffic as well. Thank you for your consideration.

537

Comment

Do a tunnel to reclaim the waterfront!

538

Comment

I support the full tunnel for many reasons which have already been used before. Ditto the reasons, but vote yes for me for the tunnel. Thanks!

539

Comment

I support the full tunnel alternative. This option gives Seattle a opportunity to reinvent its waterfront and create a city 'front door' that is beautiful, functional and it will create economic opportunity. It is worth the money. Put the noisy, stinky, fast traffic underground and leave the waterfront for pedestrians, parks, and businesses. The people who make this project happen will be remembered and appreciated as visionaries.

540

Comment

Dear Mayor Nickels, I am writing to urge you to help take advantage of an incredible opportunity for Seattle. The Alaskan Way Viaduct has cut Seattle off from its waterfront since the 1950's. The end of its useful life offers us a chance to remedy one of the worst urban planning decisions in Seattle's history, and reclaim our connection to Elliott Bay. Other cities around the globe have recognized and remedied similar mistakes, to the current and long-term benefit of their communities. I believe that the City of Seattle and the Central Puget Sound region will be more vital and more successful if we do not build a new highway along Seattle's central waterfront. Improvements to arterial connections and transit would allow us to accommodate Viaduct freight and car traffic while easing congestion for us all, avoid a decade of disruption to businesses and residents, and avoid the billion dollar liabilities of a megaproject. We owe it to ourselves and our children to be rethink the way we provide stewardship to Seattle's waterfront. Therefore, I urge you to work toward the inclusion of a "no-highway" alternative in the Viaduct EIS. Sincerely, Carole Jo Williams,

541

Comment

The EIS needs to analyze what is likely the simplest, cheapest, and least disruptive solution -- fixing the larger transportation network instead of building a new highway.

542

Comment

I believe the full cut-and-cover tunnel is the best option to facilitate flow of traffic while giving us the opportunity to shape the Seattle waterfront into a landmark destination it has the potential to be, by adding more parks, shops, community spaces and maximizing pedestrian access and safety.

543

Comment

I strongly believe that the EIS needs to further analyze what is most likely the simplest, cheapest, and least disruptive solution, which I feel would be fixing the larger transportation network, instead of building a new highway. Thank you for your consideration, Tara Breitenbucher

544

Comment

Dear DOT, I was recently in Vancouver and I was struck by how far ahead of Seattle it is in urban planning. Vancouver has taken fantastic advantage of its waterfront in providing public access, parks, living spaces and views. There are no freeways in the city of Vancouver and yet traffic seems to move better there than in Seattle. I am writing to urge you to help take advantage of an incredible opportunity for Seattle. The Alaskan Way Viaduct has cut Seattle off from its waterfront since the 1950's. The end of its useful life offers us a chance to remedy one of the worst urban planning decisions in Seattle's history, and reclaim our connection to Elliott Bay. Other cities around the globe have recognized and remedied similar mistakes, to the current and long-term benefit of their communities. It is no exaggeration to say that the downtown waterfront in Seattle is potentially one of the great urban spaces in the world. I believe that the City of Seattle and the Central Puget Sound region will be more vital and more successful if we do not build a new highway along Seattle's central waterfront. Improvements to arterial connections and transit would allow us to accommodate Viaduct freight and car traffic while easing congestion for us all, avoid a decade of disruption to businesses and residents, and avoid the billion dollar liabilities of a megaproject. We owe it to ourselves and our children to be rethink the way we provide stewardship to Seattle's waterfront. Therefore, I urge you to work toward the inclusion of a "no-highway" alternative in the Viaduct EIS. The waterfront is the worst possible place for a highway. The billions that would be spent on a new tunnel or surface street would be much better used if put toward other transportation improvements which would compensate for the loss of the waterfront route.

545

Comment

The EIS needs to analyze what is likely the simplest, cheapest, and least disruptive solution -- fixing the larger transportation network instead of building a new highway. Building a new highway would be too costly and would reclaim the most prized part of downtown that has the potential to draw the public into the city. We need to perform the research on the various alternatives for rerouting and redistributing traffic with what we already have. This seems viable and would save billions of tax dollars.

546

Comment

I support the full tunnel alternative. For less than 20% more than the other alternatives, we can recreate a useable waterfront for the next generation. Please find a way to make the full tunnel alternative happen.

547

Comment

I would like to strongly recommend the "tunnel alternative" be chosen for the 99 replacement. First, the waterfront area should be connected with the rest of the downtown, and primarily have a park/retail feel. The waterfront is one of Seattle's greatest assets and the viaduct ruins the atmosphere of the area. Thus, the aerial and surface alternatives are unacceptable. Secondly, SR99 needs to have as much capacity as possible to make up for the lack of expandability of I-5 through downtown. In fact, 99 should become an easily accessible bypass highway for I-5. So, even with its cost, the tunnel alternative is best. The bypass tunnel is the second choice given cost constraints. Thanks for taking our comments.

548

Comment

go with the full tunnel. this is 100 year strategic project- don't make the same mistake twice and build another viaduct. we'll be going through the same process in another 40 years if you do. get the money through federal state and city bonds and tax increment financing. think about the future, not just today's traffic whines. thanks, rg

549

Comment

I am writing to fully support the Tunnel Alternative. What a great and wonderful gift we could give to ourselves and to our downtown/tourist industry if we had a waterfront that was available to all citizens. Please consider the Tunnel Alternative as the only alternative for the city of Seattle now and for the future generations.

550

Comment

It's time to connect Seattle to the waterfront!

551

Comment

I support the FULL TUNNEL OPTION. We have a unique opportunity to enhance our sad and dilapidated waterfront once and for all. Make Seattle better: Remove the viaduct!

552

Comment

How can we consider alienating Seattle from Puget Sound for another 50 years? We have suffered enough having to have our front door cut off from the rest of the city by the viaduct. Think outside of the money, think of the legacy that could be created. Think of how you can improve this city. Build the Tunnel. You have an opportunity here to go down in the annals of Seattle's history as the forward thinking entity that realized that an extra outlay of money at one point would be more than made up for in a century of increased tourism, enhanced community and a city that welcomes its visitors to visit its waterfront, rather than shunt them off from the value Seattle has in its waterfront property. Don't be known for saving a few bucks by making the same mistakes that previous Seattle governments did. Have a vision. Make a statement. Grow Seattle into the potential that it might have if it wasn't cut off from the body of water that has made it beautiful.

553

Comment

After reviewing the options for the replacement of the viaduct and the seawall I strongly urge WSDOT to make an investment in the future of the city. The tunnel may be more expensive initially but the benefit to the city will be enormous. I believe the tunnel is generally accepted as the best alternative, we must push forward with it. In addition to this I would like to bring up the surface traffic issue. I have seen the sections through the proposed tunnel and the amount of space dedicated to surface traffic is quite intimidating. The lanes broken up but unusable strips of plantings does not seem like a good idea. If the traffic could be minimized or pushed off to one side of the right of way to allow for a greater depth of usable pedestrian space at the water, it would be greatly preferred. thank you jason hanner

554

Comment

I support a more pedestrian oriented waterfront. Where connections from downtown to the waterfront are encouraged through pedestrian friendly crossings occur. Public Open parks space along the waterfront would also be a priority over high speed vehicle transit. Moving business traffic onto Western Avenue would help balance the need for surface traffic to support waterfront businesses while allowing the pedestrian to feel safe and have a connection to the waterfront. Thank you.

555

Comment

I am a West Seattleite and I strongly favor the full tunnel alternative. There is not another alternative that would better fit with the City, its needs and the diverse constituencies that live and work in and around Seattle. The cost may seem like a lot to some, but in the long run we've got one shot at this corridor and we've got to do it right. My main concern is that the people of West Seattle have access in and out during construction. I leave 'in and out' open for the reason that access to I-5 and 1st Ave S. was not enough after the 2001 earthquake and I fear it won't be during construction for this project either. I support improvements to the current configuration to help get traffic off of the bridge and moving north and south and would like to see access to/from 99 maintained in some capacity during construction. Construction will be tough and access will undoubtedly be limited, but please try not to forget your friends on the west side. Also, this project has had the best public outreach I have seen on a project this size. Keep up the good work!

556

Comment

As a lifetime resident of Seattle, I have been able to enjoy the drive through Seattle on the Viaduct, with its inspiring view of Puget Sound and its feeling of openness. It would be tragic to lose this great in-the-air thoroughfare, especially if it were replaced by a tunnel or by a surface roadway. I make the following comments based on my already strong support of the in-the-air Viaduct and on what I have managed to glean from the DEIS. As a busy, working person I could not read every page, but I did my best to cover the basic information. I would support the REBUILD ALTERNATIVE, and am also open to the AERIAL ALTERNATIVE. Perhaps some aspects of the former could be modified by aspects of the latter; I would hope so. I believe the REBUILD would be more popular than the AERIAL, since the AERIAL is wider and thus would take up more space near the waterfront and cast more shadow, but that does not bother me personally. Also, the REBUILD would take considerably less time to build than would the AERIAL – a very important consideration indeed! (1) DRIVING ALONG AN IN-THE-AIR VIADUCT IS A COMFORTABLE AND INSPIRING EXPERIENCE FOR SEATTLE RESIDENTS AND VISITORS: With an in-the-air viaduct, everyone can enjoy the view of Puget Sound, instead of only wealthy downtown condo owners. And it enhances tourism, quickly affording tourists a spectacular view and a sense of what the whole downtown is like; solid walls of commercial buildings (which would replace the existing viaduct) would make this impossible. Many commuters are forced to drive long distances nowadays and I believe it is more important to consider THEIR needs than to be mainly concerned about how pleasant the downtown area could be for pedestrians, residents and nearby businesses. Furthermore, commuters will be more willing to pay a toll to travel along a viaduct than through a confining tunnel. I for one would never travel through a tunnel, if that is built, as I would find it claustrophobic -- especially when forced to sit in it during traffic jams -- and, as I explain below, vulnerable to dangers. (2) THE REBUILD AND AERIAL ARE SAFER THAN THE TUNNEL ALTERNATIVES: A tunnel would be more vulnerable to terrorist attack than the open viaduct, and thus it would require costly security measures at all times. Moreover, built on shifting landfill, it would not be safe in an earthquake, or would cost too much to ensure such safety. As for the Battery Street tunnel, I like the improvements offered in the AERIAL ALTERNATIVE – the emergency exits, fire suppression system, and improving the ventilation – and wonder why these could not be added to the REBUILD ALTERNATIVE. If cost is the only consideration, I think that would be worth the extra cost. Increased traffic caused by the SURFACE and BYPASS TUNNEL ALTERNATIVES would increase the number of vehicle and pedestrian accidents and injuries. (3) TRAFFIC FLOW IS BETTER WITH THE REBUILD AND AERIAL ALTERNATIVES THAN WITH THE SURFACE OR BYPASS TUNNEL ALTERNATIVES: With the SURFACE ALTERNATIVE, travel times would increase for trips to and from downtown, and especially to and from the Ballard/Interbay area: 26 minutes to get from Ballard to the SODO area, as compared to 13 minutes with an aerial alternative! And this alternative would increase congestion on downtown city streets and Alaskan Way, thus probably causing traffic noise levels to increase on other adjacent streets. The REBUILD ALTERNATIVE is better than all the other alternatives, which it does NOT – as do those others -- increase the number of congested intersections due to expanding Mercer Street. High traffic volumes of the SURFACE ALTERNATIVE and the BYPASS TUNNEL ALTERNATIVE could make recreational resources less desirable to visit or harder to get to. And the BYPASS TUNNEL would increase travel times between the Duwamish and Ballard/Interbay industrial areas, an important route for freight. (4) THE REBUILD AND AERIAL ALTERNATIVES WOULD CAUSE LESS DISRUPTION AND ANNOYANCE, IN MANY IMPORTANT WAYS, THAN WOULD THE OTHER ALTERNATIVES: First, let's avoid a Boston-Big-Dig type of nightmare, and build an aerial viaduct rather than a (more expensive) tunnel! ** The REBUILD would not affect parks, recreation and open space, which would remain about the same as they are now. It would benefit public service providers, as overall traffic would improve. ** THE AERIAL would benefit public service providers by improving overall traffic operations. It would affect some buildings and businesses, and in this respect is less desirable an alternative than the REBUILD. ** The REBUILD and AERIAL ALTERNATIVES might include sound-absorptive materials to reduce noise reflected off the bottom of the elevated structure and around the tunnel portals, and this would probably be worth any extra cost to those people most affected by the noise. ** The REBUILD would cause the loss of fewer parking spaces than would the other alternatives. ** THE AERIAL would take longer (possibly three years longer!) to build than the REBUILD, so this is another reason I prefer the REBUILD to the AERIAL. Thank you for your consideration of my interest and opinions.

557

Comment

The EIS needs to analyze what is likely the simplest, cheapest, and least disruptive solution -- fixing the larger transportation network instead of building a new highway. Give Seattle back to those who want to live there. The city's future depends on a livable city center.

558

Comment

The following are my substantive comments on the Draft EIS. I have included procedural comments in a separate response. Two obvious and substantial omissions in the EIS, and the overall Viaduct project documentation, are: (1) the absence of any concrete analysis of traffic impacts, and (2) the lack of discussion lower cost alternatives to the proposed construction impacts (specifically, the temporary elevated highway). As a resident of the waterfront community and city taxpayer, I find it inconceivable that the member organizations have proposed a massively costly "temporary" elevated by-pass highway in answer to completely unquantified traffic impacts. I describe them as unquantified, because until a detailed analysis of surface street impact throughout the city is completed, there really is not way to quantify them based on partial or complete closure of the existing viaduct alone. Because a thorough traffic impact analysis is lacking, there is no basis for a rational cost-benefit analysis of construction impact mitigation alternatives. The proposed "temporary" highway would definitely not be justified, for example, to mitigate an average 10 to 15 minute longer commute through the city. Nor would it be even faintly justified if it results in only slightly less disruption than using surface streets to absorb viaduct traffic, but stretched over a much longer time frame due to construction risks involving the structure itself. Secondly, and most glaringly, there is virtually no discussion of compensating for impacts on the large and growing waterfront community, which includes several condominium residential developments, several restaurants, a major hotel, the Port of Seattle Maritime Discovery center and its museums, to name only a few. How are these individuals and businesses to be compensated for lost property values, disruptions, and lost business, both during construction and during the life of the "temporary" over flight highway? Additionally, the document does not address two inevitable and glaring risks of the "temporary" overflight structure itself: safety of the structure in its proposed setting, and the nature of "temporary" given today's fiscal realities. Specifically: (1) How are the residents, tourists, and businesses of the waterfront to be protected, during construction of this "temporary" highway and afterwards, in the event the structure itself is damaged and rendered unsafe by another earthquake? You will be placing a massive structure in a position to damage or destroy residences and parks, putting the people who live and work in these areas at much higher risk than at present. (2) What provision will be made to ensure the timely completion of the "temporary" highway, to ensure that it is not fiscally undermined and left as an eyesore on the Seattle waterfront, to the detriment of the entire city? This is arguable the single most important development issue facing the City of Seattle of this generation. This is not simply another monorail extension or a highway access issue. Your decision concerning the Viaduct, and in particular, the "construction impact" of the "temporary" highway will profoundly and permanently affect the most valuable city asset, its waterfront. Accordingly, this project more than any other deserves and exhaustive examination, forward-thinking analysis, AND an equitable solution for those who will, under your current proposal, be asked to bear a disproportionate measure of the cost. If not in the "Environmental Impact Statement", then where, of all places, are these issues to be publicly discussed?

559

Comment

Take this opportunity to make the Elliot Bay Waterfront something that people will enjoy for generations instead of a place where traffic, noise, and exhaust overwhelm pedestrians. I support the no highway alternative. I spend 5 - 7 days a week working in an office one block from the viaduct in Pioneer Square.

560

Comment

Bury the traffic in tunnels. Open the area for pedestrians: workers, residents, and tourists. Provide places to: touch the water and look back at the city, reflect, have lunch, roller blade, jog, stroll, walk, ride, promenade, ogle, hug, kiss, read, nap, interact, draw, paint, listen, smell, and be proud to live here.

561

Comment

June 1, 2004

Comments on the Alaskan Way Viaduct Draft EIS

As an urban planner and long-time Seattle resident, I am writing about the incredible opportunity we have to revitalize the city's waterfront. An opportunity to fix our 1950's mistake that built a viaduct that cut the downtown off from the waterfront.

The Draft EIS fails to address this opportunity. Every viaduct replacement option has at least eight lanes of motorized vehicles on Alaskan Way. No alternative considers Alaskan Way as a local street, providing waterfront access for all citizens. At a minimum, there should be no net increase in roadway to Alaskan Way.

The cut-and-cover tunnel alternative is the best option. However, the lid over SR 99 must be extended from Pine Street to Battery Street, providing connections between the waterfront and the Pike Place Market.

Prior to selecting a preferred alternative and finalizing the EIS, an additional alternative must be developed for the Alaskan Way corridor. This alternative must have no net increase of Alaskan Way roadway--five lanes maximum for driving, parking, turning and deliveries. And the alternative must extend the cut-and-cover lid to Battery Street.

Sincerely,
Mary McCumber
1111 First Ave West
Seattle, WA 98119

562

Comment

We need to step up to the plate and invest in the future of our city and waterfront and do the only alternative that would be best for the city....The full tunnel and seawall replacement. Anything else is a cop-out and will be a detriment to our city.

563

Comment

I want to express my support for the Tunnel Alternative and to encourage the city to minimize car traffic at the surface. I believe that we have an historic opportunity to recreate a connection to our waterfront. A tunnel will be an efficient traffic mover while the surface can create a pedestrian friendly environment which could be an economic windfall for the city. The possibilities for public and commercial space along our piers are incredible and unique. This is our chance to recapture an essential element in Seattle's history and improve our city for everyone.

564

Comment

We have an opportunity to fix a serious transportation problem while creating usable, amenity-rich space for future generations of our community--if the Tunnel alternative is chosen. The chance to connect our downtown with the waterfront in a significant way should not be missed. It is this sort of visionary thinking that creates world class cities! Let's not screw it up by holding onto the familiar at the expense of our future.

565

Comment

The following relates to a very serious procedural issue regarding the EIS. I have provided my substantive comments on the document by a separate response. I am a resident of the Waterfront Landings Condominium development, a waterfront residential development whose members will suffer extreme and disproportionate impacts as a result of the proposed temporary fly-over highway. My procedural comment is this: fourteen months ago, before I purchased my condominium and as a portion of my due diligence efforts as a potential waterfront landowner and taxpayer, I read every document regarding the Viaduct replacement project available on the WSDOT Viaduct project website. In addition, I contacted, by telephone, WSDOT project contact staff. Throughout this effort I was attempting to answer one simple question: will any of the proposed Viaduct alternatives result in construction north of the current Seattle Aquarium (and therefore in the immediate vicinity of Waterfront Landings). I was assured both in the documentation and personally, by DOT staff, that there would be absolutely no construction north of the Aquarium or in the vicinity of Pier 62/63 or Waterfront Landings. A year later I learn that construction will not only continue north of the Aquarium, but pass mere feet from my residence, a "detail" that remained hidden from public scrutiny until April of this year when the Draft EIS was issued. The decision to announce the temporary fly-over highway, a massive construction project, costing in the vicinity of \$170-200 million and imposing 6-11 years of vastly negative impact on quality of life, community, businesses, tourism, and property values along the waterfront was, on its face, irresponsible and even corrupt. To treat this huge, costly and risky project as a mere impact mitigation is dishonest beyond comparison. It will have a substantial and possibly massive impact on the overall cost of Viaduct restoration, depending on which of the existing alternatives is chosen, and to treat it as a somehow separate, non-negotiable aspect is completely wrong and unacceptable, and will only result in a strenuous legal backlash from the waterfront community and other city residents. Consequently, by trying to "back door" this monstrous project, you have probably only ensured that, in the end, it will take much longer and cost much more than if you had simply included it as one of the original, public proposals.

566

Comment

All of the currently proposed alternatives are wrong-sighted. The city does not need a newer and bigger highway on its magnificent waterfront, especially at the prospective cost to taxpayers and to small businesses that will surely not survive the extended construction project of taking down and replacing the Alaskan Way Viaduct. WADOT needs to study and propose a non-highway alternative to the Alaska Way Viaduct that will maximize non-vehicular use of the waterfront and will benefit the fragile waterfront ecology. The city has an unpredicted opportunity to create a model waterfront, yet all of the alternatives in the draft EIS fail to realize this opportunity. Rather, they're all more classic Seattle boondoggle, on the scale of the Denny Hill regarding almost 100 years ago.

567

Comment

As a long term resident of the Greater Seattle area, if the project cannot be shored up safely, my vote would be to tear it down and shift the traffic to I-5 in the best way possibly. After visiting Boston and experiencing the mess of traffic and the cost overruns of the BIG Dig that will haunt the citizens of Boston for many years to come. I vote against the tunnel. While visiting Rio de Janeiro, one of their treasures is the viaduct free, freeway free waterfront drive and beautiful walkway. The distance from the tall buildings to the piers is about the same and they created two one way streets with a divider in between that is serviceable and functional. Traffic speeds are about 25 mph and it moves well through the area. It is beautiful and enhances the city. The route is by Copacabana Beach if you would like to further research this idea. Seattle could make the waterfront it's treasure for the citizens and visitors. Taking the viaduct down would improve the look of the city. Let's not drag out a debt that will affect our children and grandchildren for many years to come and be fiscally responsible.

568

Comment

The EIS needs to analyze what is likely the simplest, cheapest, and least disruptive solution -- fixing the larger transportation network instead of building a new highway.

569

Comment

The EIS needs to analyze what is likely the simplest, cheapest, and least disruptive solution -- fixing the larger transportation network instead of building a new highway.

570

Comment

1. Any clutter on the waterfront is abomination to be avoided. Beautiful and friendly space in Seattle is always in too short of a supply.
2. Total elimination of expressway near the waterfront needs to be examined and reported.
3. A "temporary" flyover bridge during construction is foolishness not to be considered.
4. Preliminary cost differences seem so small that the best must be preferred.

571

Comment

I grew up in Seattle, and love the city and its waterfront. I have also always admired the use to which Vancouver B.C. has put its waterfront property; so much is public access. We now have a grand opportunity to connect the downtown Seattle area with the waterfront, and to enhance the public open air spaces in between. Please put as much of the highway 99 project as possible underground, and develop public park places on the surface. This is not the time for public parsimony. For our future generations, please take advantage of this opportunity for enhancing the connection between downtown Seattle and its waterfront.

572

Comment

I am for a no-highway alternative to be studied in the EIS. Don't fill our waterfront with construction. Don't make our downtown unlivable. Don't force downtown businesses out of business. We don't need another highway in Seattle.

573

Comment

Mayor, I am writing to urge you to help take advantage of an incredible opportunity for Seattle. The Alaskan Way Viaduct has cut Seattle off from its waterfront since the 1950's. The end of its useful life offers us a chance to remedy one of the worst urban planning decisions in Seattle's history, and reclaim our connection to Elliott Bay. Other cities around the globe have recognized and remedied similar mistakes, to the current and long-term benefit of their communities. I believe that the City of Seattle and the Central Puget Sound region will be more vital and more successful if we do not build a new highway along Seattle's central waterfront. Improvements to arterial connections and transit would allow us to accommodate Viaduct freight and car traffic while easing congestion for us all, avoid a decade of disruption to businesses and residents, and avoid the billion dollar liabilities of a megaproject. We owe it to ourselves and our children to be rethink the way we provide stewardship to Seattle's waterfront. Therefore, I urge you to work toward the inclusion of a "no-highway" alternative in the Viaduct EIS.

574

Comment

In the long term, it really does seem that the tunnel alternative would be the best for the City as a whole. Avoiding the barrier that would result from the rebuild or aerial options would significantly improve the livability and appeal of the City to downtown employees and residents, as well as tourists. Although some have expressed concern about the windfall current residents may receive from removal of the barrier, the more important consideration is the long-term benefit to the economy and quality of life downtown as new residents and visitors are attracted to the area. And much as I love the view from my car while I'm on it, I don't think the viaduct should be viewed as a scenic route -- rather, it's a critical transportation corridor and the speed of travel through it should to be maximized. The tunnel alternative is also superior to the others as to noise, travel time and construction time. It costs about 15% more than the replacement/aerial/bypass -- a smaller differential than I expected considering the exciting benefits it is likely to provide to the economy and livability of the City, over the long term.

575

Comment

I completely disagree with all of the "choices" offered regarding the Alaskan Way Viaduct. None of them are cost efficient. Each project would require many years of construction at an incredible expense. All require huge inconvenience to the Pioneer Square community, both the business and those people who live there. Any type of Viaduct construction would likely result in the closure of many businesses in the area.

There are better ways of solving Seattle's traffic problems. WSDOT has again failed the people of the city of Seattle.

576

Comment

This project will drive myself and most of my neighbors out of Pioneer Square. What are you thinking!?!?! This is the dumbest thing I have ever heard of. If the tunnel is selected and built, a giant noisy hole will exist right next to Pike Place Market - Seattle's crown jewel. And another one will exist in Pioneer Square - our heritage. Stupid stupid. Or, another viaduct if you pick the aerial option - that viaduct already renders the waterfront into a noisy ugly grotesque zone. Tear it down and put a park in there - people will flock down there. I have been told that your various options will bring us 7.5 to 11 years of 24 hour a day construction: jackhammers, dump trucks, pile drivers and detours 24/7. Unacceptable. It will drive all business out. You'll be left with a noisy ghetto. \$4,100,000,000 is the estimated cost of the tunnel. Modern mega projects commonly go way over budget. I'm told that economists estimate that this will tie up all available public funding for our region for the next 30 years. Insane. I'll take my tax dollars to Tacoma before i support something like that. 1200 businesses are within a block of the construction mess, with city staffers predicting "the strong will survive and the marginal won't make it." Thanks a lot - I'm one of those small business that you don't care about. Good bye Seattle, you have betrayed me. If this is the best you can do then I'm outta here. Why not look at alternatives that build a beautiful downtown Seattle. I love what the folks at peopleswaterfront.org are proposing. Make Seattle something awesome, not another downtown L.A.

577

Comment

The city would be much improved and become more enjoyable and livable with the tunnel alternative.

578

Comment

The EIS needs to analyze what is likely the simplest, cheapest, and least disruptive solution -- fixing the larger transportation network instead of building a new highway.

579

Comment

Former Governor Dan Evans, who has a background in engineering, once commented that the Alaska Way Viaduct should not have been built in the first place. It is constructed on a liquefaction zone. The geology there is notoriously unstable. I would heartily recommend, therefore, either a surface alternative, seawall, or any other proposal that would minimize construction in that area. I would also like to add that a prolonged period of construction in that area would decimate some of the smaller businesses in that area, leaving little else but the corporate chains.

580

Comment

The EIS needs to analyze what is likely the simplest, cheapest, and least disruptive solution -- fixing the larger transportation network instead of building a new highway.

581

Comment

As a neighbor who travels through and spends a lot of time in the big city, I have to recommend the full tunnel option. We really need more public, waterfront space put to good use in our city, and this seems the time to make things better. We need a good north south transportation route, but we also need attractive public spaces, parks, restaurants and shops. Let's make better use of the natural resource we have available: the waterfront.

582

Comment

Hi my name is Barb Christenson and I really think it would be a shame to deny all those people who use the viaduct even once in while especially when taking visitors along the water showing them the city and everything and putting them in a tunnel and I don't know why you don't higher somebody like Cal Trava to do a beautiful bridge kind of structure that would go along the waterfront that would have a nice connection to the street below, and something beautiful for people to look through to the water beyond. There is definitely an opportunity for an incredible city symbol at that point and I hope you would consider it. Thanks bye.

583

Comment

Rebuild the Viaduct. The other options are much too costly and disruptive.

I am one of the many thousands who both rely on the viaduct and appreciate the chance to see the view.

I also rely on the parking underneath the viaduct. It will have to be replaced if any other option is chosen.

Thank you

Roger Curtis
West Seattle
206-935-9678

584

Comment

Seattle's waterfront is potentially the greatest asset of the city; it is now cut off from the rest of the city by a noise corridor that renders the crown jewel an industrial howling nightmare. The tunnel alternative would not solve that as now proposed both because of the years of construction and disruption; but also because the two primary areas needing protection from the noise and traffic, Pioneer Square and the Pike Place Market would still be impacted by the ingress and egress openings to the tunnel and the noise would be concentrated and preserved for all time. There should be no major traffic conduit on the waterfront; it should be a preserved and protected destination, not a transit corridor.

585

Comment

Alaskan Way Viaduct

I am writing to urge you to help take advantage of an opportunity for Seattle. The end of the useful life of the Alaskan Way Viaduct offers us a chance to reclaim our connection to Elliott Bay. Other cities have recognized and remedied similar mistakes, to the current and long-term benefit of their communities. I believe that the City of Seattle and the Central Puget Sound region will be more vital and more successful if we do not build a new highway along Seattle's central waterfront.

Improvements to arterial connections and transit would allow us to accommodate Viaduct freight and car traffic while easing congestion for us all, avoid a decade of disruption to businesses and residents, and avoid the billion dollar cost of a megaproject for a very short stretch of road. We owe it to ourselves to rethink the way we provide stewardship to Seattle's waterfront. Therefore, I urge you to work toward the inclusion of a "no-highway" alternative in the Viaduct EIS.

Karen Merola

586

Comment

I strongly believe that the EIS needs to study options that focus on the larger transportation network. If San Francisco can demolish the Embarcadero freeway successfully - shifting the traffic burdens to other more feasible routes - without replacement, shouldn't we at least investigate that option for our own waterfront? I'm sure most are aware of the long term disruption and budget overruns on projects such as the "Big Dig" in Boston - it may be many years before that project even begins to live up to the early (and misguided) hype of the planners and engineers. Meanwhile, the damage to the existing fabric and its businesses will be forever. Let's think about what life might be like without a major highway along the waterfront now, before we get pulled along by the momentum of any ill conceived and under-funded notions of a new highway.

587

Comment

I prefer the bypass tunnel alternative as it seems to provide a very user-friendly surface street while focusing the bulk of the traffic below the surface.

588

Comment

The EIS needs to analyze what is likely the simplest, cheapest, and least disruptive solution -- fixing the larger transportation network instead of building a new highway.

589

Comment

I would like to submit my comment on the Draft EIS for the Alaskan Way Viaduct and Seawall Replacement Project.

To begin with, I strongly favor the full tunnel option (not the bypass tunnel) for several reasons. First, it would reduce noise pollution in the downtown/waterfront area. Second, it will open space along the waterfront that can then be used in new and improved ways, such as green / open space and parks for the public; new thoroughfares for bikes and pedestrians. Third, it will remove an eyesore from the Seattle skyline.

Living in West Seattle, I also urge you to maintain traffic flows along SR 99 for as long as possible so that we are not forced into a lengthy Sunday drive simply to get downtown.

Finally, I would like to say that with the tunnel option and the opening up of a new corridor for the city, I strongly urge the City of Seattle and the Department of Transportation to think creatively in the development of this new space. Is it really necessary to have 4 lanes of traffic plus two parking lanes??? What about a long, wide, tree-lined strip of paths and trails that can be used by pedestrians, tourists, cyclists, and others. Can we PLEASE not summarily give priority to CARS!?! There are others out there who would like to enjoy the waterfront as well. As it is now, it is an absolute nightmare for most cyclist to get through downtown. An opened up waterfront provides a fabulous opportunity to change that!

The opportunity to replace the viaduct with an innovative and fresh approach to urban development should not be missed! Thank you!

Anonymous in West Seattle.

590

Comment

1. I would like Hwy 99 to remain open to traffic during the construction. 2. There should be new ramps constructed to connect southbound Hwy 99 with the West Seattle Bridge. (The current configuration requires slow arduous travel on surface streets with stoplights.) Both of these roads serve 100,000 cars daily, per Seattle Dept of Transportation map. It's appalling that there is not yet ramps to go south on 99 from WS Bridge and to get on WS Bridge when approaching from the south on 99. Thank you.

591

Comment

I believe the appropriate alternative to be No Build. This based on the viaduct's deteriorated condition, funding uncertainties, a construction start for replacement many years off, and public safety. A No Build alt should not preclude upgrades and stabilization of failing elements. Stabilization of the footings, supporting soils, soils behind the seawall and structural upgrades could be accomplished at a cost of 1-2% of that of the other alternatives. A concern is that presently anticipation of the other alternatives is a distraction in the funding of necessary stabilization efforts. The responsible approach, considering the potential loss of life, property, transportation and commerce due to the impending failure public leaders have led us to expect, would be the immediate commencement of efforts to insure us of a safe and functional system until such time funding a replacement is assured and physical construction begun. Undertaking these efforts would insure us of an open! rating facility while relieving us of the cost, liability and other impacts should the structure fail or be closed. Should funding be assured and the project a likely reality my preferred alt would be the 6 lane tunnel. I only reviewed the Draft Executive Summary and found it lacking in discussion and costing of the No Build Alt. Thank you for allowing and supporting public comment. GW

592

Comment

The EIS needs to analyze what is likely the simplest, cheapest, and least disruptive solution -- fixing the larger transportation network instead of building a new highway. PLEASE do not allow construction of an alternate bypass tunnel. The focus should be to build a park in place of existing overpass and focus on a subway system for transportation needs. alternatives just won't cut it for our city.

593

Comment

The EIS needs to analyze what is likely the simplest, cheapest, and least disruptive solution -- fixing the larger transportation network instead of building a new highway.

594

Comment

The EIS needs to analyze what is likely the simplest, cheapest, and least disruptive solution -- fixing the larger transportation network instead of building a new highway.

595

Comment

Hello. professionally I am not a planner, architect etc. but speak as a Seattle native who has followed the viaduct replacement/waterfront planning process.

At its current height, the viaduct does bisect the Seattle waterfront and makes it much less inviting than it could be. If it were to be rebuilt aerially, I would like to see it several stories higher; and, if that is not practicable, then the tunnel alternative is the best.

In all EIS alternatives, a surface route with 3-4 lanes of traffic going each way is envisioned. This is too much surface traffic. At most, there should be 2 lanes each way on the surface. The point is that pedestrians need to move easily between the waterfront and the city, and anything beyond 2 lanes of traffic 1-way essentially just moves the viaduct down onto the street, creating yet another barrier with noise, pollution, and safety problems.

Of course, there should be wide, well-marked bicycle lanes, and places at either end of downtown where car owners could park their cars and ride bikes around the downtown core (I am not sure whether this idea, my own, has been presented by Cascadia or any of the architectural firms which donated their own time to the charette (sp?) sponsored by Allied Arts).

In addition, in Chap. 7 tunnel alternative the tunnel is seen as shoring up the seawall. To beautify the shoreline and allow better alternatives for salmon, the shoreline should be made as "natural" as possible with pocket parks, such as those on Alki beach. Vegetation should overhang the shoreline in places to allow cooler places for young salmon. This would mean the tunnel would be built further east.

The alternatives presented by Cascadia should be given heavy weight. I have seen their presentation, looked at their schematics, and they present a view of Seattle's future that is exciting, innovative, environmentally and pedestrian/bicyclist friendly, as befitting a city with such a bounty of natural and intellectual resources. Seattle needs to be on the cutting edge.

However, I am also heavily concerned with historic preservation, and it is important to ensure that Pioneer Square and other older brick buildings are preserved. I do not know whether they would be better preserved with a tunnel or with an aerial structure. Shoring up of foundations may be more expensive, but worth it. Seattle needs every single historic structure left in the downtown -- without them, architecturally, it turns into just another sleek "upscale" city.

Please! Incorporate the ideas of Cascadia and the comments of People for Puget Sound, as well as those of Allied Arts! Thank you, Karen Tofte

596

Comment

To whom it may concern: I have been living in Seattle for 25 years and I am a third generation Seattleite. I currently use SR99 to commute to work. However, I would be extremely happy to use another route while we replace the Viaduct with a tunnel. A tunnel is the best solution for multiple reasons. First of all, the concrete mass of the Viaduct pollutes the scenic beauty of Puget Sound. The amazing views from our local businesses and apartments are stifled from this monstrosity. The sound pollution from the Viaduct is another factor. I cannot go for a day-time stroll without being disturbed by the constant noise from the borage of large trucks and cars. Underneath the Viaduct is a seedy scene as well. It smells of urine and alcohol. Sketchy characters loom in the many shadows provided by the Viaduct making our city unsafe. My friends and I have even witnessed large rats scurrying across the sidewalks at night. Not only is the Viaduct offensive to our eyes and ears, but it stifles the growth of our city's prime real estate. It hinders our businesses, condominiums, and apartment complexes from reaching their potential on this great property. If we are already going to spend a large amount of money to replace the existing structure, we should go ahead and take this opportunity to enhance our city's waterfront the most by building a tunnel. It may be more expensive but future generations of Seattleites will undoubtedly be grateful. The long term effect of building a tunnel will be beneficial for our entire community. Tourism will increase which will result in even more capital coming into our city. I think the average citizen won't mind paying the extra money to greatly enhance the Seattle Waterfront. This is our chance to have the premier waterfront on the West Coast. It is a once in a lifetime opportunity to make our waterfront beautiful. It can and should be something we will all be proud of. I look forward to a better city. Thank you, David Friedl

597

Comment

The EIS needs to analyze what is likely the simplest, cheapest, and least disruptive solution -- fixing the larger transportation network instead of building a new highway.

598

Comment

thank you for the opportunity to comment. The EIS does not address the simplest alternative of not building a new highway. These funds could be better spent improving the larger transportation network instead. Sincerely, Terry Galiney Seattle, WA

599

Comment

MATTHEW A FOX
1407 ½ NE 56TH
SEATTLE, WA 98105
(206) 527-0648
mattfoxseattle@hotmail.com

June 1, 2004

WSDOT
Attn: Allison Ray
999 Third Avenue, Suite 2424
Seattle, WA 98104
Vial email to awvdeiscomments@wsdot.wa.gov

To Whom It May Concern,

I am writing to offer my comments on the Alaskan Way Viaduct/Seawall Replacement DEIS. This letter will offer general observations and recommendations on the larger project, as well as addressing a number of detailed project elements and concerns. To summarize the main points: the tunnel alternatives are probably unrealistic in the face of likely funding, and the rebuild option should remain on the table, including a scaled-back version should full project funding not be available; the proposed Mercer Street component has no relation to the purpose and need for the Viaduct/Seawall project, and it will make traffic circulation worse rather than better; and there are a number of specific areas that require further study in the FEIS.

One of the key flaws in this planning effort has been a serious disconnect between the development of the Preferred Alternative and what is financially feasible. In short, this effort is likely to result in the public policy equivalent of a champagne plan on a beer budget.

Let's say my mother's house needs to be remodeled. Do I begin with the assumption that only the best will do, and plan the project on that basis, or do I plan the project with the likely resources available in mind? This is not a hypothetical question. There is considerable pressure from a number of quarters, most notably the City of Seattle, to build a gold-plated tunnel option. Now, if unlimited Federal money were available, as was the case with Boston's Big Dig, this would not be a bad thing. In the real world, however, there is a significant difference between the \$3.2 billion cost to rebuild of the Viaduct and \$4.5 billion to replace it with a tunnel - and those costs are before overruns, which are likely to be significantly higher with the tunnel options.

It is easy to envision a scenario in which the Tunnel Alternative is adopted as the preferred one, other proposals do not receive further study, and then voters decline to fund a tunnel. In this scenario, tens of millions of dollars are likely to be squandered on a plan that can't be funded. Please note, this discussion is far from academic - Mayor Greg Nickels already redirected \$5 million of the proceeds from the sale of property in South Lake Union to Vulcan NW that had been earmarked for street improvements, and was instead used to prop up the AWV Viaduct study process when State funding was eliminated by the passage of Initiative 695.

At the very least, the rebuild option needs to be given further study should funding for the tunnel not be available. Moreover, a more limited rebuild option should be considered - if failure of the Seawall is what threatens the Viaduct and the waterfront, it should be repaired, and those sections of the Viaduct most damaged in the Nisqually Quake (the curve along S. Washington in particular) should be shored up. The cost savings of the bypass tunnel are not sufficient to justify its negative effects on surface traffic, and this option should not be considered further. The proposed surface alternative seems to offer little area benefit while making both local and through traffic much worse, and should also be scrapped.

There is also the issue of the inclusion of revisions to the Mercer Street corridor north of the Battery Street Tunnel that have absolutely nothing to do with repairing or replacing the Viaduct, and that will also make traffic WORSE between Seattle Center and Interstate 5. To understand how this happened, a brief review of the history of the proposal is in order.

When the replacement of the Viaduct with a tunnel was first proposed, planners intended to replace the Battery Street Tunnel. This created what was touted as an "opportunity", but could also be called a pretext, to include expensive new plans to reconfigure Mercer Street as a two-way street, as proposed and advocated for in a privately-funded study and lobbying effort by Vulcan Northwest.

Subsequently, widespread public sticker shock over the \$11 billion estimated initial cost of a tunnel led planners to decide to retain the existing Battery Street Tunnel. Despite the disappearance of the initial rationale for their inclusion in the DEIS, the proposed revisions to Mercer/Broad Streets are still included in most of the Alaskan Way Viaduct/Seawall alternatives – despite the fact that these changes have absolutely nothing to do with fixing the Viaduct and/or Seawall. Indeed, loading this project

down with pork for one of the world's richest men will undermine public support for the Viaduct – especially when they find out that the \$200 million dollar project will actually INCREASE the travel time from Seattle Center to I-5 over the no-action scenario (source – Parsons-Brinkerhoff study of Mercer Corridor).

It is also interesting to note that the latter study was not included in the list of background studies conducted in relation to this project – probably due to its inability to justify the Mercer project on the basis of “fixing the Mercer Mess.” (A side note, the draft version of the P/B Study originally used language regarding “fixing” Mercer until it became apparent these changes would not do so. The final version shifted gears and instead cited the manner in which this \$200+ million project “achieved other policy goals.”)

It is telling that the language of the Viaduct DSEIS regarding “purpose and need” for the Viaduct/Seawall replacement projects is largely silent on why there is a “purpose and need” to lump the Mercer Corridor into this project. However, given that Vulcan NW has been at the table throughout the Waterfront Planning process, and that it is a member of the “Funders Group” of corporations expected to underwrite a future RTID election campaign, it is not a stretch to say that the “purpose” of including Mercer in this DEIS is that Vulcan wants funding for its development plans, and the State “needs” their money to pay for an election campaign.

It is also revealing that the DEIS cannot point to any significant benefit to traffic circulation of the proposed Mercer revisions. On page 155 of the Transportation Index, for example, it is noted that “...the widened Mercer Street will decrease the quality of existing connections (by removing existing ramps to Mercer and Broad street)...” This phenomenon is also noted on page 186 of this index, which states “While arterial connectivity will increase in the South Lake Union area under these alternatives (those which reconfigure Mercer), the quality of connections on and off SR 99 will decrease with the removal of the off ramps to Mercer and Broad Streets...some vehicles may take alternate routes rather than SR 99 to access the South Lake Union area since off-ramp connectivity will be decreased...”

This results in the unhappy situation described on page 190, “The number of congested intersections in the South Lake Union area will increase in the build alternatives that include conversion of Mercer into a 2-way street.” This will be further compounded if the City of Seattle is unable to fund the other segments of the Mercer Street reconfiguration.

As page 152 states, “Though the two schemes studies offer differing advantages and disadvantages, the overall connectivity in the South Lake Union area is similar across alternatives.” In other words, a component of this project unrelated to the Viaduct/Seawall that is included to “improve connectivity” actually does little to do so. This is hardly a ringing endorsement of a \$200+ million add-on to a project that already will be hard pressed to find adequate funding. It is also interesting to note that one table shows connectivity from northbound SR 99 to East South Lake Union as decreasing from “good” to “fair” with the expenditure of \$200 million or more to reconfigure Mercer.

Another glaring absence in all of the transportation Index is near-complete the lack of discussion of the effects on Dexter Street in any of the EIS scenarios. The study area ends south of the off ramp to Dexter from southbound SR 99, so no figures were available for this route at all. This is particularly significant in light of the fact that the inability to get across SR 99 from east to west is cited as a key reason to reconfigure Mercer Street. In fact, southbound SR 99 traffic can already easily access the east side of South Lake Union by taking the Dexter cutoff, and one can only speculate as to why this information was not considered in the EIS (OK – I'll speculate – it's to prop up a set of costly changes to Mercer Street that cannot be justified on their merit). At the very least, significant traffic will likely find its way on to Dexter, both during and after construction – particularly of the Battery Street Tunnel. The lack of information on this phenomenon in the EIS is unacceptable.

If an additional crossing of SR 99 is deemed essential, the effects of an overpass at Thomas and/or an underpass at Roy Street (per the South Lake Union Neighborhood Plan) ought to be considered in the FEIS as lower-cost projects to create additional connectivity without the short-term disruption and long-term negative traffic effects of the Mercer schemes.

Also in the section on “Purpose and Need”, the DEIS cites the current lane widths as deficiencies that need to be corrected. This presumably would weigh against the Rebuild option in favor of a new expanded elevated Viaduct, for example. I would like to point out that the West Seattle Bridge originally had 12-foot lanes, as the DEIS calls for in all new roads, but that the City of Seattle narrowed these to 10-11 feet to restripe the Bridge to allow a bus lane just last year. I guess the 12-foot standard only applies when it suits the purposes of local government and/or transportation planners.

Similarly, the fact that existing on and off ramps are not to current design standards is not sufficient rationale to remove them – particularly since they will eliminate the mid-town connections to either the tunnel or rebuilt versions in either scenario. If there are accidents caused due to tailgating in the southbound direction at the Western Street exit, speed limits and signage should be adjusted to prevent them. Closing this exit throws out the baby with the bathwater, limiting downtown access because of the illegal behavior of a relatively few drivers (an unrelated proposal to close the exit ramp to Queen Anne hill at the southern end of the Aurora Bridge suffers from the same faulty logic).

Similarly, the change on page 42 of the Transportation Index to “Urban Street” methodology for calculating acceptable LOS' north of the Battery Street Tunnel seems suspect – as this term assumes signalized intersections that do not now exist. Again, this seems to be a misuse of technical criteria to justify a pre-determined result (in this case, to make the Mercer revisions look more attractive, or at least less bad for circulation and area Levels of Service).

There is also a discrepancy between the 2030 figures for projected mode shift listed on page 143 of the Transportation Index and the most recent figures the City of Seattle is proposing for the 10-year Update of its Comprehensive Plan. For example, the Viaduct EIS cites an increased mode shift for transit from 23% of Downtown

trips in 2004 to 45% in 2030. Similarly, the EIS cites a 2004 figure of 77% of vehicle trips, and projects that it will decline to 55% in 2030. However, the Executive's proposed changes to the City of Seattle Comprehensive Plan show that public transportation's share of Downtown trips is projected to increase from 7% in 2000 to 9% in 2020, and that SOV and carpool trips equaled 69% of 2000 daily Downtown trips and are proposed to fall to just 61% of trips in 2020.

Granted, there is some discrepancy because the EIS numbers are for work trips, and the Comprehensive Plan figures assume trips over a 24 hour period. Nevertheless, one cannot help but be left with the impression that unduly optimistic mode shift assumptions were made, most likely because the effects on LOS of the Mercer Street proposals would be unacceptable if numbers were used that acknowledged real world travel choices (i.e. – using figures that assumed that a significant number of people will continue to drive, even at the level assumed in the Complan's revised new numbers).

One detail that should be addressed is the effect of adding a travel lane to First Avenue South, as proposed under the surface option. Given the width of the street, I am assuming that this would involve removing an existing travel/parking lane. However, most of the businesses on First do not have alley loading, and bands, for example, have to park on First Ave S. to load equipment into the many nightclubs in this area. The question of business access ought to be taken into account in the FEIS.

Given that most of the public process around Waterfront and Viaduct planning has occurred in Downtown forums that were targeted to the planning and design community, it is little surprise that there is considerable momentum for the proposed tunnel among Seattle's movers and shakers. Others now advocate tearing the Viaduct down without replacing it, in the hope that minor revisions to I-5, existing surface routes and tolls will somehow absorb 100,000+ trips per day.

If one reviews the comments submitted at community forums in Ballard and/or West Seattle, I have no doubt that citizens in these neighborhoods were more concerned with getting to and from their homes and businesses than with Waterfront design and open space issues. If the price of "reconnecting Seattle with its Waterfront" is cutting over 100,000 residents of Northwest and Southwest Seattle off from the rest of the City, the price is too high.

Thank you for considering these comments.

600

Comment

In an effort to make our city livable into the future I support the tunnel option. Assuming we will be disrupting traffic for several years with any of the options then the end result should create something better than what we have now. The viaduct as is severely limits the use and enjoyment of our greatest asset-the waterfront. We are a maritime city and have completely cut off the heart/birth place of the city from the water. The area of the roadway at Alaska Way needs to be maintained at its current size with no net increase of surface area. The area should be no larger than 5 lanes total for driving, parking, turning and deliveries. I've seen wonderful studies by the city and Allied Arts which locate additional traffic to improved downtown streets and the Trolley to Western Avenue. Moving the trolley puts pedestrians and tourists between shops in Pike Place Market and Pioneer Square and the waterfront providing equal opportunity for access and use! The lid should cover the tunnel from Pine to Battery Street. The end result should provide quality public space for commercial and non-commercial use and enliven the waterfront edge which will supply new vitality and activity to the downtown neighborhoods.

ING THE PRESENT STRUCTURE ONE LANE ON BOTH VEHICLE LEVELS - THIS PROVIDES ONE THIRD INCREASE IN TRAFFIC CAPACITY ON EA LEVEL. A WIDER STR. COULD BE STRENGTHENED AND ALLOW A PEDESTRIAN PROMENADE / LINEAR PARK THAT WOULD SERVE THE ENTIRE WATERFRONT AND C.B.D.

Cut-and-cover tunnel/aerial structure

[illegible]

ONE COULD EXPECT TO FIND PLANTS & FLOWERS,
POOLS AS WELL AS PLACES TO WALK AND PLACES TO
BACK TO THE CBD OR DOWN FOR SHOPPING ALONG THE
PEOPLE = MOVER NORTH OR SOUTH.

IF IT WERE SUMMER, THE ROOF WOULD PROBABLY
 TIME; IT WINTER, PROBABLY CLOSED MUCH OF THE
 THE VIEW WOULD ALWAYS *Alaskan Way* BE

SCULPTURE, FOUNTAINS,
SIT AND READ OR WALK
WATERFRONT OR TAKE THE

BE RETRACTED MOST OF THE
THE TIME, BUT IN ANY EVENT
THERE.

RECEIVED

JUN 01 2004

AWVSP Team Office

Integrated seawall —

Existing
viaduct
to be
replaced

Double-deck cut-and-cover

A viaduct that increases all former viaduct traffic by a third

GLASS COVER IN INCIDENT
READER

SKY PARK

BOEING PEOPLE
MOVIE

EXISTING VIADUCT WIDENED ONE LAN.
NORTH & SOUTHBOUND

THE INDICATED STR. TOGETHER
ABOVE AND BELOW GRADE

- stain and decolor columns at design intervals for accurate waterfront C.T.S.D.

Alaskan Way

Integrated seawall —

Existing viaduct to be improved & strengthened (not torn down)

additional factors indicated as
tied together

(not required)

ALTERNATIVE #6 (SKY PARK)

BY E.N. WAHLMAN
3927 N.E. DELVOR PL SEATTLE 98105